

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.





LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 87-141  
H. R. 7445

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Index and summary of H. R. 7445 . . . . . | 1 |
| Digest of Public Law 87-141 . . . . .     | 2 |



## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 7445

- Jun. 2, 1961 House Appropriations Committee reported (on Fri. during adjournment) H. R. 7445, which was committed to the Whole House Committee on the State of the Union. H. Report No. 449. Print of bill and report.
- Jun. 7, 1961 House passed H. R. 7445 with an amendment.
- Jun. 8, 1961 H. R. was referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee.
- Jul. 14, 1961 Senate subcommittee voted to report H. R. 7445 to the full committee.
- Jul. 25, 1961 Senate committee reported H. R. 7445 with amendments. S. Report No. 620. Print of bill and report.
- Jul. 29, 1961 Senate began debate on H. R. 7445.
- Jul. 31, 1961 Senate passed H. R. 7445 with amendments.  
Senate conferees were appointed.
- Aug. 1, 1961 House conferees were appointed.
- Aug. 3, 1961 Conferees were granted permission to file a report.
- Aug. 4, 1961 House received (during adjournment of the House) the conference report on H. R. 7445. H. Report No. 850. Print of report.
- Aug. 7, 1961 Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7445.
- Aug. 17, 1961 Approved: Public Law 87-141.



DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 87-141

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1962. Includes funds for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Civil Service Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and Veterans Administration. Provides \$6,000,000 for the President for disaster relief.









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department  
Staff Only)

### CONTENTS

Issued June 6, 1961  
For actions of June 5, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 93

#### Agricultural

|                       |      |
|-----------------------|------|
| appropriations.....   | 1,25 |
| Appropriations.....   | 1,24 |
| Conservation.....     | 10   |
| Education.....        | 21   |
| Electrification.....  | 11   |
| Farm program.....     | 6    |
| Federal spending..... | 12   |
| Feed grain.....       | 8    |
| Foreign aid.....      | 13   |
| Forestry.....         | 10   |
| Holiday.....          | 19   |
| Housing.....          | 14   |
| Manpower.....         | 22   |
| Minerals.....         | 3,23 |
| Peace Corps.....      | 6,15 |

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| Personnel.....      | 16   |
| Property.....       | 7    |
| Public works.....   | 17   |
| Reclamation.....    | 9    |
| Retirement.....     | 16   |
| River basin.....    | 2    |
| Sugarbeets.....     | 9    |
| Tax rates.....      | 4,16 |
| Virgin Islands..... | 5    |
| Wetlands.....       | 20   |
| Wheat.....          | 8    |
| Wildlife.....       | 20   |

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported independent offices appropriation bill (on June 2).

### HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported (on Fri. during adjournment) H. R. 7445, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1962 (H. Rept. 449). p. 8834  
~~House conferees were appointed on H. R. 5954, the Treasury Post Office appropriation bill for 1962. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. 8803~~  
~~The Appropriations Committee reported (on Fri. during adjournment) H. R. 7444, the agricultural appropriation bill for 1962 (H. Rept. 448). See Digest 92 for items of interest. p. 8834~~
2. DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPACT. Passed over without prejudice H. J. Res. 225, to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin Compact and to enter into such compact on behalf of the U. S. p. 8803
3. MINING. Passed as reported H. R. 2924, repealing an act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in Alaska. p. 8803
4. TAX RATES. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7446, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates (H. Rept. 450). p. 8834
5. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Passed as reported H. R. 4750, to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act so as to increase the borrowing authority of the Virgin Islands Corp. p. 8824

6. PEACE CORPS. Rep. Reuss discussed the roots of the Peace Corps, quoting Emerson, Thoreau, William James, and the Roosevelts, and saying "The Congress, by giving the Peace Corps a legislative foundation, can do its part in directing the American tradition of service to the challenge of the 1960's." pp. 8824-6

7. PROPERTY. Received from GSA a proposed bill to "amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to remove the limitation on the maximum capital of the general supply funds"; to Government Operations Committee. p. 8833

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

8. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. St. George inserted an article from the American Agriculturist, "Agricultural Act of 1961," analyzing the omnibus farm bill. pp. A4028-9

Rep. Breeding inserted a resolution of the Trego County (Kan.) Farmers Union commending Secretary Freeman for his efforts in getting the feed grain bill passed and urging support for enactment of wheat legislation. p. A4030

9. SUGARBEETS; RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Saylor urging increased domestic quotas for sugarbeet producers and opposing construction of the Burns Creek power project in southeastern Idaho as "unnecessary, uneconomical, and a distortion of traditional concepts of reclamation." pp. A4007-8

10. CONSERVATION; FORESTRY. Rep. Ullman inserted an editorial, "Secretary Udall's Promise," quoting Secretary Udall as stating that he and Secretary Freeman were working together in "Formulating a comprehensive Federal recreational lands program and working to eliminate conflicts in fish and wildlife programs so that an increased and improved wildlife conservation effort may be made." pp. A4023-4

11. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Younger inserted an editorial stating that Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the NRECA, "is disappointed that President Kennedy has not initiated a 'bold new forward thrust' to get Washington more deeply into the electricity-generating business. He views with alarm that the Soviet Union is at work on a 'mighty power generation and transmission pool,' and he claims that this Red program is partly in operation." p. A4015

12. FEDERAL SPENDING. Rep. Derounian inserted an editorial quoting former President Eisenhower as stating that "I believe deeply that continuing deficit spending is immoral." p. A3977

13. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Derwinski inserted an editorial, "More Aid, Long Term," opposing instituting a long-term foreign aid program. p. A3979  
Rep. McIntire inserted an editorial, "Can You Buy Peace and Prosperity?," criticizing the President's foreign aid proposal. p. A4019

14. HOUSING. Rep. Derounian inserted an editorial, "Sand Castles," criticizing the President's proposed housing bill as an effort "to build castles for everyone." pp. A3987-8

15. PEACE CORPS. Rep. Doyle inserted an editorial, "Flying Blind," criticizing the establishment of a Peace Corps to assist underdeveloped nations. p. A3994  
Rep. Brademas inserted an address by R. Sargent Shriver discussing operations and activities of the Peace Corps. pp. A4010-11



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

---

JUNE 2, 1961.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 7445]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The budget estimates considered by the Committee in connection with the bill appear in the Budget for 1962 in sections for the Executive Office of the President, pages 68 to 76; Funds Appropriated to the President, page 83; Independent Offices, pages 105 to 252; General Services Administration, pages 253 to 289; Housing and Home Finance Agency, pages 291 to 329; and amendments to the Budget contained in House Document Nos. 125, 129, 156, 157, 158 and 162.

#### SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1962, includes funds for twenty-three independent executive agencies. The committee has made a reduction of \$201,463,000 in the budget estimates it has considered in developing this bill, and appropriations it recommends are \$69,945,400 less than the corresponding amounts for 1961. The appropriations recommended are \$8,424,098,000 and the budget estimates are \$8,625,561,000. Over one-half the total provided in the bill, \$4,879,571,000, is for the Veterans Administration, and the House habitually refuses to accept any modest reductions in most of the VA programs. The next largest sum is \$1,200,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

A summary of amounts recommended for each agency is set forth in the following table, and a full tabulation by items of appropriation is included in the back of the report.

| Agency   | Budget estimates, 1962      | Recommended in bill         | Bill compared with budget estimates |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| National Aeronautics and Space Council-----        | \$320, 000                  | \$320, 000                  | -----                               |
| Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization-----      | 104, 200, 000               | 79, 167, 000                | —\$25, 033, 000                     |
| Disaster relief-----                               | 6, 000, 000                 | 6, 000, 000                 | -----                               |
| Civil Aeronautics Board-----                       | 90, 750, 000                | 83, 700, 000                | —7, 050, 000                        |
| Civil Service Commission-----                      | 95, 502, 000                | 91, 844, 000                | —3, 658, 000                        |
| Federal Aviation Agency-----                       | 744, 300, 000               | 723, 500, 000               | —20, 800, 000                       |
| Federal Communications Commission-----             | 12, 525, 000                | 12, 400, 000                | —125, 000                           |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board-----                  | <sup>1</sup> (12, 981, 000) | <sup>1</sup> (12, 981, 000) | -----                               |
| Federal Power Commission-----                      | 8, 793, 000                 | 8, 793, 000                 | -----                               |
| Federal Trade Commission-----                      | 10, 690, 000                | 10, 000, 000                | —690, 000                           |
| General Accounting Office-----                     | 43, 000, 000                | 43, 000, 000                | -----                               |
| General Services Administration-----               | 556, 105, 000               | 539, 325, 000               | —16, 780, 000                       |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency-----               | 262, 050, 000               | 247, 950, 000               | —14, 100, 000                       |
| Federal National Mortgage Association-----         | <sup>1</sup> (7, 450, 000)  | <sup>1</sup> (7, 400, 000)  | (—50, 000)                          |
| Federal Housing Administration-----                | <sup>1</sup> (71, 975, 000) | <sup>1</sup> (67, 600, 000) | (—4, 375, 000)                      |
| Public Housing Administration-----                 | 183, 450, 000               | 178, 968, 000               | —4, 482, 000                        |
| Interstate Commerce Commission-----                | 22, 200, 000                | 21, 950, 000                | —250, 000                           |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration----- | 1, 235, 300, 000            | 1, 200, 000, 000            | —35, 300, 000                       |
| National Capital Housing Authority-----            | 40, 000                     | 40, 000                     | -----                               |
| National Science Foundation-----                   | 277, 000, 000               | 250, 000, 000               | —27, 000, 000                       |
| Renegotiation Board-----                           | 3, 000, 000                 | 2, 900, 000                 | —100, 000                           |
| Securities and Exchange Commission-----            | 11, 015, 000                | 11, 000, 000                | —15, 000                            |
| Selective Service System-----                      | 34, 475, 000                | 33, 670, 000                | —805, 000                           |
| Veterans Administration-----                       | 4, 924, 846, 000            | 4, 879, 571, 000            | —45, 275, 000                       |
| Total-----   | 8, 625, 561, 000            | 8, 424, 098, 000            | —201, 463, 000                      |

<sup>1</sup> Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses.

## EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of \$320,000 for salaries and expenses of this Council. Its responsibilities are to advise and assist the President, as he may request, with respect to the performance of functions in the aeronautics and space field. The agency has been recently reactivated as authorized by Public Law 87-26, approved April 26, 1961, and expenses are being financed on a temporary basis in 1961 from emergency funds of the President.

## OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The Committee has approved appropriations totaling \$79,167,000 for this agency in 1962, an increase of \$18,079,000 over the appropriations for civil defense for fiscal year 1961 and \$25,033,000 less than total budget requests. The recommendations contained in this bill do not include revised programs for civil defense the President recently indicated he will submit at a later date.

*Salaries and expenses.*—The Committee has allowed \$25,000,000 for personnel and other operating expenses of the agency, a reduction of \$5,500,000 in the budget estimate. This is the same level of appropriation as Congress approved for 1961, except for a \$346,000 reduction the Committee has made in jobs in the District of Columbia from its present high level. Such personnel are now over 50 in excess of the 303 specifically allowed by the Congress for 1961. For 1962 the authorized staff level in this appropriation is 1,600 and the positions in the District of Columbia are earmarked in the language of the bill at not to exceed the 303 approved for the current year.

*Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,567,000 for allocation to other Federal agencies for carrying out delegations of authority from OCDM. This is a reduction of \$2,133,000 in the \$8,700,000 budget estimate and is the same amount as was provided for this purpose in 1961. It will support an average of 498 jobs in other agencies, which are in addition to the 1,600 in OCDM.

*Federal contributions.*—The Committee has allowed the budget estimate of \$22,000,000 for matching grant programs for equipment, training, personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations, which is an increase of \$6,000,000 over this year. The new program of matching grants for State and local personnel has been in operation only for the last six months of the current fiscal year, and the increase in the bill represents the full-year costs for continuing the present program level.

*Emergency supplies and equipment.*—An appropriation of \$21,600,000 is recommended for maintaining the stockpile of emergency supplies and equipment owned by the Federal government. This is an increase of \$12,425,000 over 1961 and a reduction of \$14,400,000 in the budget estimate. There are 1,932 emergency hospitals of 200 beds each assembled now. In addition to maintaining the present stockpile of equipment the bill provides for procuring an additional 500 hospitals instead of the 1,000 as the agency had requested.

*Research and development.*—The Committee recommends \$1,500,000 for research and development programs, which is the same as 1961 less a non-recurring item of \$2,500,000 for a program of prototype fallout shelters for demonstration purposes which is being completed this year.

*Construction of facilities.*—The bill contains \$2,500,000 of which \$2,400,000 is for construction of a second regional control center. The Director is authorized to use not to exceed \$100,000 of this appropriation for the first center if he finds this to be necessary to obtain a functional facility.

## FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

*Disaster relief.*—The Committee has included the \$6,000,000 budget estimate for assistance to States and local governments in coping



with major disasters as authorized by Public Law 875, 81st Congress. The unobligated balance is presently \$5,400,000 and it is estimated that it will be down to \$4,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year. The recommended appropriation will restore the fund to \$10,000,000 which is considered a minimum balance at the beginning of a fiscal year for this purpose.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES

### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The budget estimate for salaries and expenses of the Board, including a \$100,000 increase in a revised estimate to conduct special policy studies for the most urgent needs of the Board, is \$9,050,000. The bill recommended by the Committee provides \$8,900,000, including \$50,000 for the special studies. This is an increase of \$1,047,500 over 1961 and a reduction of \$150,000 in the budget requests, and will give the Board approximately 70 additional positions to handle its increasing workloads. The Committee has not allowed funds to increase statistical reporting and is of the opinion that 20 positions allocated to international activities are too many and can be reduced.

*Payments to air carriers.*—The bill includes \$74,800,000 for payment of subsidies to local service, Alaskan and helicopter air carriers, which provides \$7,700,000 less than 1961 and \$6,900,000 below the budget estimate. The Committee cautions the Board about certifying more carriers in Alaska where the number should be consolidated instead of creating a new subsidy every time an additional one is certified. This is also the last year the Committee plans to recommend funds for subsidy for helicopter operations and the amount in 1962 for this purpose has been reduced from the \$6,900,000 budget estimate to \$5,000,000 and earmarked in the bill at not to exceed this amount. The total amount of subsidy paid out since 1954 to the three helicopter carriers receiving subsidy will be more than \$36,000,000 including the reduced amount included in the bill for 1962.

### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The Committee recommends \$21,029,000 for personnel and other related expenses of the Commission. This is an increase of \$268,000 over 1961 and a reduction of \$800,000 in the budget request. Federal employment is estimated at 2,035,000 in both 1961 and 1962 and the amount of work for the Commission to perform should be about the same in both years. The agency presently has 2,558 employees authorized and the bill will allow about 20 of the 93 new positions requested.

*Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations.*—The Committee has approved \$430,000 for security investigations of United States citizens applying for employment by international organizations. This is \$32,000 less than the amount appropriated in 1961 for this purpose and \$8,000 less than the budget estimate.

*Annuities under special acts.*—The Committee has approved the \$2,248,000 budget estimate for payment of annuities to persons who were employed on the construction of the Panama Canal or to their widows, and to widows of former employees of the Lighthouse Service. The amount required for this purpose is \$68,000 less than the current year.

*Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund.*—This item covers the Government's share of the cost of health insurance for Federal employees who retire after the Federal health program started. It was testified that 83 percent of employees eligible are participating, or a total of 1,800,000. The Committee is providing \$4,500,000 for such contributions instead of \$5,450,000 as proposed in the estimate because there will be an estimated \$550,000 of the 1961 appropriation carried over into next fiscal year and it does not appear that the full request will be required. The Committee has allowed \$1,000,000 for administrative expenses of this program, a reduction of \$148,000 in the budget estimate.

*Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund.*—The Committee recommends \$19,000,000 instead of the \$20,900,000 budget estimate for the Government's share of the cost of health insurance for Federal employees who were retired before the health benefit program became effective. Contribution payments were made for the month of June, but benefit payments begin with the fiscal year 1962. An amount up to 2 percent of the Government's contribution toward benefits is provided for administrative expenses in the basic law. The Committee will expect the program to be administered economically and next year will consider writing a specific limitation for such expenses.

*Increased payments from civil service retirement and disability fund for retired employees.*—The Committee has approved the budget estimate of \$44,637,000 to reimburse the retirement fund for the 1962 cost of annuity increases provided to certain retired employees by Public Law 85-465. Legislation is pending to make the increased annuity rates permanent without being dependent on annual appropriations. The Committee wholeheartedly supports the legislation, but funds should be appropriated annually to reimburse the fund for the added expense because the fund is now \$32 billion insolvent. Language is included in the bill to require that the Bureau of the Budget submit annually to the Congress estimates of the appropriations necessary to make such reimbursement. The Committee on other occasions has expressed its concern about the fund's insolvency as the deficiency continues to increase.

*Administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund.*—The budget proposed a limitation of \$262,000 on funds that may be used by the Civil Service Commission to administer the life insurance programs. The Committee has approved \$260,000, which is the same amount as 1961.

#### FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The Committee considered budget estimates totaling \$744,300,000 for this agency and recommends appropriations totaling \$723,500,000, which is an increase of \$16,076,000 over fiscal year 1961 and a reduction of \$20,800,000 in the budget estimates.



*Operations.*—The bill contains \$428,000,000 to operate the national system of air traffic control and other facilities and programs of FAA next year. This is a \$39,836,000 increase over the 1961 appropriation for this purpose and \$13,000,000 less than the budget estimate. It will provide an increase of approximately 1,087 new jobs. No funds have been included in the bill for building up staffs in overseas areas and the agency is urged to rely whenever possible on commercial people already there.

During the past year the agency has made arrangements to obtain additional space for a Civil Aeromedical Research Institute by entering into a long-term rental contract for a building to be constructed to its specifications. The method the FAA is using to finance such construction is very expensive. In the long run it would be better for the Government to build its own buildings on its own land for its agencies, and the Committee will expect to be advised in advance of any divergence from this policy in the future.

The Administrator, since the Committee held its hearings, has reviewed the program for medical research in civil aviation to determine what he would recommend as being necessary. The budget estimate originally proposed a staff of 200, almost a 250 percent increase over 1961. On the basis of his assurance that a staff of 120 will do the job the Committee is providing \$1,500,000 to expand the program to this extent and it is to be held at this level in the future, nor is any work of other agencies to be duplicated by the FAA.

*Facilities and equipment.*—The Committee has approved \$120,000,000 for new facilities and equipment. This continues the stepped-up program of modernization started a few years ago. An unobligated balance of \$107,273,000 will also be carried forward into 1962. The request to construct a fire test wind tunnel at a cost of \$4,550,000 has been denied, as has \$423,000 for fallout shelters in various installations. The agency may use a reasonable amount of the funds provided for remodeling one of the 70 or more existing wind tunnels already owned by the government.

*Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization).*—The Committee has approved the \$70,000,000 budget estimate for payment of Federal matching grants to municipalities for airport construction projects as authorized by the Federal Airport Act. The terminal date for making new grants is June 30, 1961, under provisions of present law. These funds are to liquidate earlier grants as the projects are constructed.

*Research and development.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$60,000,000 for research and development activities in 1962, which is \$4,480,000 less than the appropriation for 1961 and \$5,000,000 under the budget. An unobligated balance of \$16,000,000 will be carried over into fiscal year 1962, which will be additional to the amount provided in the bill.

*Washington National Airport.*—An appropriation of \$3,225,000 is recommended for operation and maintenance of Washington National Airport, a reduction of \$5,000 below the 1961 appropriation and \$200,000 less than the 1962 budget estimate. This will provide a \$198,050 increase over the cost of continuing the program level of 1961. The Committee has also approved the \$4,200,000 request for construction of various items to expand and modernize the facilities at the airport including completion of an access road, expansion and



modernization of taxiway and apron systems, modernization of sewer and water systems, paving an area for helicopter operations, and replacing and relocating certain air cargo facilities.

*Dulles International Airport.*—The Committee is disappointed to learn of the slow progress being made in completing this airport which now will not open until October, 1962. A revised budget estimate of \$20,100,000 was submitted during the course of the hearings for additional construction requirements at this airport including \$4,597,000 for 10 small projects and \$15,503,000 for the added cost of contractor claims, inflationary factors and underestimation of construction costs. The Administrator has informed the Committee that since even the revised estimates were prepared it has become evident that it will be necessary for the Government to finance the construction of at least one four-bay hangar at \$6,000,000 before the airport can be used. Earlier plans anticipated that the airlines would build these additions to the basic facility.

After reviewing the problem carefully, the Committee is recommending \$26,100,000, including funds for the hangar, which will bring total appropriations to date for this airport to \$111,070,000. Estimates on these construction items have not been reduced because in no circumstances will any more overruns be considered. The FAA is also expected to provide customs facilities at the airport within available funds.

The Committee wants to impress upon the agency that all fees and rentals for this airport, hangars and facilities should be at a figure that is sufficient to amortize the entire cost of acquiring land, construction, maintenance and interest over a reasonable period of no longer than 20 to 25 years, and that escape clauses should be in all contracts whereby the Government can re-evaluate them every three years or less.

The Committee has included language in the bill to provide separately for maintenance and operating costs of the new facility. Due to the delay in construction the Committee has allowed \$1,975,000 for this purpose instead of \$2,575,000 as requested, a reduction of \$600,000 in the estimate.

*Civil supersonic aircraft development.*—The Committee has approved \$10,000,000 instead of the \$12,000,000 requested in a revised budget estimate for a feasibility study of the development of a civil supersonic aircraft. The study is expected to require 18 months to 2 years to complete. The Committee will expect the Administrator to hold down the total cost and do a complete job for not more than \$20,000,000.

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Committee recommends \$12,400,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission in 1962, which will provide about 50 additional employees. This is an increase of \$611,000 over the comparable figure for 1961 after excluding the funds provided for a special study, and is a reduction of \$125,000 in the request. The Committee has allocated 7 of the staff increases to the Common Carrier Bureau, 20 to Safety and Special Radio Services, and 20 to the Broadcast Bureau including 10 to the Rules and Standards Division. The Committee also strongly urges the Commission to add 3 hearing examiners and to use all the power and authority it presently has to make delegations and reduce the number of matters awaiting decision.

## FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The Committee has approved a \$1,725,000 limitation for administrative expenses as requested by the Board for 1962. While this appears to be a decrease of \$346,000 from 1961, it is in fact an increase of \$115,419 as certain expenses of supervision will be financed under the non-administrative expense limitation next year. The Committee has also included language authorizing funds to be used for consultant services, which the agency has requested.

The Board proposes that examination and supervisory functions relating to local institutions be together and financed with funds for nonadministrative expenses. This recommendation has been approved. The Committee has also allowed the budget amount of \$10,366,000 for such expenses.

The bill contains as another item the \$890,000 budget estimate for administrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. This is an increase of \$33,000 over 1961.

## FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The Committee has approved the full \$8,793,000 budget estimate for the Commission. This is an increase of \$629,500 over the 1961 appropriation and will provide funds for 82 additional positions. The Committee has also provided a \$45,000 increase in the travel limitation for holding prehearing conferences and formal hearings in the field.

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Committee considered total budget estimates of \$10,690,000, including a supplemental of \$1,050,000 to enable the Commission to make compliance investigations on 56 court judgments as requested by the Department of Justice. In 1961 the Commission has a staff of 823. The 1962 estimates, as revised, provide a staff of 1,119, or an increase of 296 jobs. The Committee recommends \$10,000,000, which will give an increase of \$1,990,500 or 230 employees. This is about a 25 percent increase in one year. The request for 10 additional hearing examiners and 5 clerical employees for reducing the backlog of cases has been approved in full, and the Committee intends that at least 66 of the new jobs be used to handle the compliance work. The request for \$190,000 for rental of additional office space has been reduced to not in excess of \$100,000. The Committee considers that it has provided a very generous increase for 1962 and is going to expect the Commission to produce accordingly.

## GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The bill includes the \$43,000,000 budget estimate for the General Accounting Office in 1962, which is an increase of \$821,000 over this year. This agency absorbed \$1,852,000 of the pay act costs in 1961. The Comptroller General has 5,172 positions now and is requesting 50 less in 1962. The Committee thinks the Comptroller General is doing an outstanding job.

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

*Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$170,000,000 for management of



real property programs. This is \$8,000 over 1961 and a reduction of \$6,000,000 in the budget estimate. The Committee is of the opinion that the amount of leased space can be reduced to a larger degree than the estimates reflect as new buildings are placed into operation. The estimates include \$4,200,000 to operate newly constructed buildings in 1962, but they reflect only a \$2,500,000 decrease for released space.

This item in 1962 also includes no funds to acquire and operate additional leased space to support expanding programs of other agencies, nor for space previously financed by reimbursements. Funds for these purposes are included in estimates of other agencies and will be transferred to the General Services Administration. A general provision is included in the general provisions for GSA to authorize such transfers.

*Repair and improvement of public buildings.*—The Committee has approved \$58,000,000 to renovate public buildings, which continues the same appropriation level as 1961. The Committee has again disallowed the request for \$2,000,000 to make alterations to existing buildings to provide fallout shelters.

*Construction, public buildings projects.*—The Committee recommends \$171,600,000 for public buildings construction projects in 1962 at the locations listed in the following table.

*Public buildings projects included in the bill*

| Location   | Sites and Expenses<br>(previously funded) | Construction Cost | Total         |
|--|---|-------------------|---------------|
| Decatur, Alabama-----                            | 33, 000                                   | 1, 315, 750       | 1, 348, 750   |
| Los Angeles, California-----                     | 405, 149                                  | 27, 388, 500      | 27, 793, 649  |
| Long Beach area, California-----                 |   | 2, 000, 000       | 2, 000, 000   |
| Denver, Colorado-----                            | 388, 000                                  | 18, 145, 000      | 18, 533, 000  |
| Statesboro, Georgia-----                         | 16, 000                                   | 538, 650          | 554, 650      |
| Winder, Georgia-----                             | 29, 000                                   | 475, 000          | 504, 000      |
| Chicago, Illinois-----                           | 580, 000                                  | 31, 293, 000      | 31, 873, 000  |
| Santa Fe, New Mexico-----                        | 65, 000                                   | 2, 362, 650       | 2, 427, 650   |
| Wyandotte, Michigan-----                         | 15, 000                                   | 402, 800          | 417, 800      |
| New York, New York-----                          | 831, 100                                  | 59, 222, 050      | 60, 053, 150  |
| Bryson City, North Carolina-----                 | 29, 000                                   | 753, 350          | 782, 350      |
| Thomasville, North Carolina-----                 | 18, 000                                   | 327, 750          | 345, 750      |
| Pembina, North Dakota-----                       | 10, 000                                   | 183, 350          | 193, 350      |
| Cincinnati, Ohio-----                            | 290, 000                                  | 17, 432, 500      | 17, 722, 500  |
| Medford, Oregon-----                             | 52, 459                                   | 1, 728, 050       | 1, 780, 509   |
| Johnstown, Pennsylvania-----                     | 40, 000                                   | 1, 187, 500       | 1, 227, 500   |
| Lebanon, Pennsylvania-----                       | 27, 000                                   | 730, 550          | 757, 550      |
| Deby Line, Vermont-----                          | 14, 000                                   | 267, 900          | 281, 900      |
| FOB No. 8, District of Columbia-----             | 60, 000                                   | 3, 800, 000       | 3, 860, 000   |
| GPO Field Plant, District of Columbia-----       | 36, 000                                   | 1, 545, 650       | 1, 581, 650   |
| Small projects outside District of Columbia----- |   | 500, 000          | 500, 000      |
|  | 2, 938, 708                               | 171, 600, 000     | 174, 538, 708 |

The Committee has generally reduced the amount for each project by five percent, which is less than savings that have been made by

the General Services Administration in construction cost contracts of projects already completed. Funds are also specifically disallowed for installing fallout shelters in each project. The bill includes funds for 20 major projects, and \$500,000 as has been provided in previous years for construction of such small projects outside the District of Columbia as the Administrator may determine. The Committee again cautions the agency to use sound business judgment and insure that good, substantial and usable buildings are completed without excess trimmings.

The Committee has made three material changes from the program as submitted in the budget estimates. (1) It has added \$5,623,050 to the project in New York City as there is some question whether it could be constructed within the cost limitation contained in the budget estimate. (2) The proposed General Services Administration storage depot at Denver, Colorado has been disallowed as it is not considered feasible to construct this new building at this time. (3) The Committee has included in the bill \$2,000,000 for constructing separately an appraisers store and warehouse in the Long Beach waterfront area. The project for Los Angeles has not been reduced in size as all the space will be needed for future growth.

During the hearings the Committee was informed that there are twenty-eight additional projects that have a construction capability in 1962. The estimated cost of these other projects is \$142,078,000 and the Committee will expect that they be included in the 1963 budget program.

*Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.*—The Committee has included in the bill \$25,000,000 for sites and expenses for additional projects, which is \$4,000,000 more than the 1961 appropriation and \$20,000,000 above the budget estimate. This amount is needed for financing the site and expense costs of projects that are now pending or will be submitted to the Public Works Committees this year.

*Payments, public building purchase contracts.*—The bill includes the \$5,200,000 budget estimate for payment of principal, interest, taxes and other expenses in connection with purchase agreements made under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954. The estimate provides for payments to contractors and taxing authorities on 20 projects.

*Construction, Federal office building numbered 7, Washington, D.C.*—The Committee has approved \$23,700,000 for construction of a Federal office building on Lafayette Square for use of agencies of the executive branch. The reduction of \$2,475,000 reflects a reduction of 5 percent in the estimate based on construction cost experience for other projects in the D.C. area, and \$1,227,000 is for elimination of fallout shelter features.

*Operating expenses, Federal supply service.*—The bill provides \$7,385,000 for personal property management activities. This is an increase of \$713,400 over comparable appropriations for 1961 and \$287,000 less than the budget estimate. Of the total amount \$3,450,000 will be financed by appropriation, and \$3,935,000 from proceeds received from the sale of excess personal property. The increase over 1961 includes \$427,600 to strengthen and promote the utilization and sales program and \$285,800 for cataloging and other activities.



*Expenses, supply distribution.*—An appropriation of \$27,375,000 is recommended for operating the General Services Administration stores and supply system. This provides an increase of \$1,913,800 over comparable appropriations for 1961, and it is a reduction of \$1,999,000 in the budget estimate. The Committee has allowed a part of the increase requested based on new workload but has not allowed the request for funds to increase the amount of space allowed for a given quantity of inventory.

*General Supply Fund.*—A \$4,000,000 increase in capital for the General Supply Fund is recommended instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed in the estimate. The capital has only recently been increased by \$20,000,000 in a supplemental bill. The additional amount will increase the appropriated capital to \$119,750,000.

*Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.*—The bill provides \$14,000,000 for managing the Government's Archives and records, which is an increase of \$3,821,000 over 1961 and \$159,000 less than the budget estimate. During the last two years the National Archives and Records Service has absorbed agency records centers and has received transfers of funds from the Department of Defense for this purpose. In absorbing or liquidating these and other agency depositories the GSA states that it has been able to save 553 positions from those previously required to administer such records. In 1962 the financing for this increased work will be financed from this appropriation item.

*Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,475,000 for these activities. This is \$61,000 less than 1961 and \$25,000 under the 1962 budget estimate. The Committee went into the activities of this service carefully in the hearings and it was testified that only 50 of some 273 employees are engaged in representation work before regulatory bodies. The Committee has not reduced the amount for representation but it does not want the number increased above the present level. The Service has grown substantially since its inception and the Committee is of the opinion it has all the employees now it needs in the foreseeable future.

*Strategic and critical materials.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$30,000,000 for the stockpiling program instead of \$40,000,000 as requested. The bill also allows \$3,000,000 for operating expenses instead of \$3,015,000 as the agency proposed.

Two language provisions were submitted in the estimates which the Committee has approved. One gives the Administration authority to acquire leasehold interests in property for storage of materials at industrial plant sites. It was testified that most of these leases are at nominal cost to the Government. The Committee has amended the language of the bill to include this requirement. The other language item provides the Administration with authority to upgrade certain materials into a form best suitable for stockpiling and make payments to contractors in kind with excess materials in storage at their fair market value. It is estimated that \$6,800,000 of such upgrading will be done in 1962. The Committee urges that other avenues for reducing stockpile excesses be pursued as there is now over \$9 billion tied up in materials on hand or on order. More than fifty percent of it is excess to our National needs.

*Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.*—The Committee recommends \$290,000 for the Office of the Administrator, which is a \$43,000 increase over the 1961 appropriation and \$40,000 above the budget estimate. It is the amount the Administrator says he needs.

*Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.*—The Committee has approved the request of \$300,000 for allowances and other expenses authorized by law for three former Presidents, and pensions for two widows of former Presidents.

*Administrative operations fund.*—A limitation of \$14,268,900 is provided for administrative, financial, legal, and other general support for GSA programs. This provides the same funding as in the current fiscal year for such services.

*Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund.*—In the corporate section of the bill the Committee has provided the budget estimate of \$42,500 for administrative expenses incident to the liquidation of the former RFC. The workload has been reduced to servicing 12 facilities, 42 miscellaneous assets and 13 liabilities. The limitation is \$500 less than in 1961.

*Working capital fund.*—The Committee has denied the request for \$150,000 to increase the Working capital fund to establish four field printing plants in addition to the present plant in Washington, D.C., as it is not convinced of the necessity for establishing these plants.

#### HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

This agency is responsible for the administration of the major housing and community development programs sponsored by the Federal government, including urban renewal, community facilities, public housing, insurance of home mortgages and providing a secondary market for Government insured and guaranteed home mortgages. The Committee considered budget estimates for these activities totaling \$445,500,000 and recommends \$426,918,000 for appropriation. This is \$82,035,000 more than appropriations for 1961 and \$18,582,000 less than the budget estimates considered for 1962.

*Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses.*—The revised budget estimate for this item is \$13,150,000. An appropriation of \$12,900,000 is recommended for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator, the Urban Renewal Administration and the Community Facilities Administration. This is an increase of \$1,885,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year and is a reduction of \$250,000 in the budget estimate. The expenses of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program are also included in this appropriation. The amount in the bill will provide for 1,440 jobs, an increase of 260 over 1961, primarily in the urban renewal programs which are growing substantially. The Committee has also amended the language which has been carried in the bill in previous years to also authorize the collection of fees in the urban planning and reserve of planned public works programs to cover the cost of services rendered.

*Urban planning grants.*—The Committee has included in the bill \$3,600,000 for matching grants to States and other planning agencies



as authorized by Section 701 of the Housing act of 1954, as amended. The present authorization for appropriations is \$20,000,000 and \$16,400,000 has previously been made available. The funds in the bill are for the balance of the authorization.

*Public works planning fund.*—The Committee has approved \$6,000,000 of the \$8,000,000 requested for payment to this revolving fund, bringing total capital in the fund to \$42,000,000. This is the same amount of appropriation as in 1961. A \$48,000,000 revolving fund is authorized for making interest-free advances to State and local public agencies for the planning of local public works. The advances are repaid when the project is placed under construction.

*Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization).*—The Committee has included the budget amount of \$200,000,000 to liquidate a portion of the obligations outstanding for capital grant contributions for urban renewal projects. The present authorization for contracts is \$2,000,000,000. Legislation is pending in the Congress to increase this contract authority substantially. To date \$464,500,000 has been appropriated to liquidate such grants and \$1,535,500,000 of the present authorization remains to be funded in the future.

*Urban studies and housing research.*—The Committee has approved \$450,000 of the \$900,000 request for a program of housing studies as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956. The Administrator is urged to proceed with caution and to select the projects to be undertaken carefully.

*Housing for the elderly fund.*—A \$30,000,000 budget estimate was considered for this item and the Committee has approved \$25,000,000. The bill also contains a limitation of \$350,000 on the amount that may be used for administrative expenses. The appropriation in 1961 was \$20,000,000.

*College housing loans (limitation on administrative expenses).*—The revised budget limitation for this item is \$2,100,000. The bill provides \$1,900,000, which is an increase of \$320,000 over the amount available in the current fiscal year and \$200,000 less than the estimate. The increase in 1962 will provide 34 of the 58 additional positions requested, or a total of 210 in this program, to meet the impact of the new authorization enacted last September.

*Public facility loans.*—The bill provides \$650,000 of the \$750,000 request for administrative expenses in connection with the program of loans to finance construction of specific public works. This is an increase of \$112,500 over the allowance for the current year.

*Revolving fund (liquidating programs).*—The Committee has included \$145,000 for administrative expenses for programs accounted for through this revolving fund. The original Government investment in programs that have been liquidated through this fund was \$2.8 billion and only \$32,900,000 in assets will remain in the fund at the end of 1962. The program now is primarily one of servicing \$29,000,000 in loans, advances and installment sales contracts.

*Federal National Mortgage Association.*—The Committee has approved \$7,400,000 for administrative expenses of the Association. This amount of limitation is \$500,000 over the amount for the current

year and \$50,000 less than the budget estimate. The portfolio in 1962 is expected to be up 14 percent over 1961.

*Federal Housing Administration.*—The Committee recommends \$9,600,000 for administrative and \$58,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses related to processing workloads of mortgage insurance applications, or total operating expenses of \$67,600,000. This is a \$589,000 increase in the current limitation on administrative and \$5,012,000 more for nonadministrative expenses. The increased limitations will provide funds for about 500 new jobs to handle the increasing work, most of them in the field offices. The agency had requested an 18 percent increase for 1962, but the workload does not warrant an increase of this magnitude.

*Public Housing Administration.*—The bill provides \$165,000,000 for payment of annual contributions to local public housing authorities. This is an increase of \$25,000,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1961 and a reduction of \$4,300,000 in the budget estimate. There will be 491,902 units in occupancy on June 30, 1961, requiring annual contributions and 30,000 more will become occupied during the year. The bill also provides \$13,968,000 for administrative expenses, an increase of \$100,000 over the current year and a reduction of \$182,000 in the budget estimate.

Two years ago the Public Housing Administration on an experimental basis offered to waive its contractual right to review local housing authority budgets in advance, and to audit the accounts of such authorities. There are no local funds in these operations, with few exceptions, and the Federal Government foots the entire bill. Since the Government is obligated to make subsidy payments, which are reduced only by any amounts remaining after operating expenses, it is obvious that the only possible way to reduce Government expenditures for subsidy payments is in careful scrutiny of local housing authority budgets and adequate audit checks to assure that expenses are reasonable and necessary. The Committee strenuously objects to any relaxation of the budget review and auditing of the local housing authorities by the Public Housing Administration. There have been substantial abuses, as in the payment of legal fees and other expenses. Instead of relaxing any of its opportunities to save money they should be increased.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Committee has approved \$21,950,000 for salaries and expenses, which is an increase of \$498,500 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1961 and \$250,000 less than the budget estimate. The increase is for 44 new jobs, including 10 hearing examiners and 5 attorney advisers to help reduce the backlog inventory of cases requiring hearings, which the Committee has specifically allowed. There are also 24 attorneys in the field who are engaged in work the Attorneys General could very well do who should be given other assignments.



## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Committee has approved in this bill \$1,200,000,000 for space programs in 1962. This is in effect the first payment on the programs of this agency for next year. The overall needs will be reviewed when hearings are held on the President's revised program. Funds in the bill provide an increase of \$236,000,000 over the 1961 appropriation level and \$35,300,000 less than the budget estimate.

*Salaries and expenses.*—The bill includes \$191,750,000 for salaries and expenses, \$4,936,000 less than the request. This will provide a \$20,990,000 increase over 1961 for additional employment, increased travel and other expenses relating to operation of the headquarters office and NASA research centers.

*Research and development.*—An appropriation of \$892,000,000 is provided for contractual research and development and supporting operations including contractual services for the operation of the NASA facilities. This is \$221,547,000 more than the amount provided this year and \$27,539,000 less than the budget estimate.

*Construction of facilities.*—The bill provides \$116,250,000 for construction of new facilities, which is \$6,537,000 less than the appropriation for this purpose in 1961 and \$2,825,000 less than the budget request. The bill designates \$20,000,000 for emergency construction as authorized by the legislative bill.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The Committee has approved the budget amount of \$40,000 for operation and maintenance of properties in the District of Columbia under Title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act. This is the same amount as the 1961 appropriation. This appropriation finances only a small part of the total Public Housing program of the District of Columbia, but it gives the Congress an opportunity to review the entire program in the Nation's capital annually.

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Committee has approved \$250,000,000 for the Foundation in 1962. The appropriation in 1961 was \$175,800,000. This is an increase of \$74,200,000 over this year and a \$25,000,000 reduction in the budget estimate. Almost all of the Foundation programs are increased next year, but the largest portion is in grants for basic research and facilities.

The estimates for 1962 include a separate appropriation item to purchase \$2,000,000 worth of foreign currencies to collect and translate scientific information. The requested authority has been approved in the amount of \$1,600,000, the same amount as 1961, but the language of the bill makes the purchase of such foreign currencies permissive and within the Foundation's regular appropriation. Only \$609,000 will be used for this purpose this year.

## RENEGOTIATION BOARD

An appropriation of \$2,900,000 is recommended for the Board for salaries and expenses for 1962. This is \$115,000 less than 1961 and is a reduction of \$100,000 in the budget estimate. The number of filings with the Board has been decreasing in recent years because of changes in the Renegotiation Act.

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Committee considered budget estimates totaling \$11,015,000 for the Commission, including a supplemental estimate for \$100,000, and recommends an appropriation of \$11,000,000. The responsibilities of this agency have been increasing steadily in recent years as activity in the financial markets has been extremely active. The amount recommended will provide a staff increase of approximately 153 jobs, or a total of 1,188, to pursue a vigorous investigative and compliance program.

## SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The Committee has approved \$33,670,000 for salaries and expenses of the Selective Service System. This is an increase of \$500,600 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1961 and a reduction of \$805,000 in the budget request. The increase shall be applied to more adequately meet the need of the local boards.

## VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

The budget estimates total \$4,924,846,000 for the Veterans Administration in 1962 and the Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$4,879,571,000. The amount the Committee has approved for 1962 is \$545,127,000 less than the appropriations for this year and \$45,275,000 less than the budget estimates.

*General operating expenses.*—The Committee has included in the bill \$161,500,000 for this item, which finances the cost of administrative expenses for all programs of the Veterans Administration with the exception of medical programs which are financed separately. The amount recommended is \$2,850,000 less than in 1961 and a reduction of \$546,000 in the request. The decline in requirements in 1962 is due primarily to declining workloads in the vocational rehabilitation and education program.

*Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.*—The Committee recommends \$40,700,000, including \$13,700,000 for medical administration and \$27,000,000 for medical research for this item. The bill provides the same employment in 1962 for medical administration as in 1961. The requested increase of 100 administrative positions in the central and area medical offices has been denied as overhead costs are getting out of line.

The budget proposed that medical research be provided for under the new Medical care appropriation which consolidates the former appropriations for Inpatient and Outpatient care into a single account. While medical research is certainly related, it does not necessarily have a direct relationship to providing care for a patient. The Committee therefore prefers that such research costs be financed under medical administration and that such funds be specifically earmarked as in recent years. The Committee recommends that



\$27,000,000 be provided for such medical research in 1962, or \$5,000,000 more than the budget estimate. The medical director feels such an amount can be properly used next year. The program has had rapid growth in recent years and the Committee will expect the program to hold at this increased figure in the future.

*Medical care.*—The Committee has approved the adjusted budget estimate of \$987,171,000 for this item after taking out medical research as set forth above. The net increase in program funding is \$33,931,000 over 1961.

The program in 1962 will provide a total of 139,372 operating beds, an increase of 903 over this year, and an average daily patient load of 141,504, an increase of 629. It includes the initial activation of the new hospital at Brecksville, Ohio, completing the activation of the new hospital at Palo Alto, California, and \$15,800,000 for increasing the quality of care and increasing patient turnover in VA hospitals to also get better utilization of the bed capacity.

*Compensation and pensions.*—The bill contains \$3,500,000,000 for compensation and pension payments to eligible veterans. This is \$300,000,000 less than the amount appropriated in 1961 and \$43,000,000 less than the budget estimate. It is anticipated that there will be an unobligated balance of \$215,000,000 carried forward at the end of this year into 1962.

*Readjustment benefits.*—The bill includes \$80,000,000, for education and training and other allowances under various benefit programs. The amount provided is \$264,000,000 under 1961 and \$376,000 less than the estimate. The large decrease results from a rapidly declining workload as benefits expire and the fact that the loan guarantee program will be financed separately from the loan guarantee revolving fund in 1962.

*Veterans insurance and indemnities.*—The Committee has allowed the budget estimate of \$39,200,000 for payment of claims under the insurance programs. The estimated requirements are \$9,600,000 less than in 1961.

*Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.*—The Committee has approved the full request of \$1,000,000 for treatment of eligible Philippine veterans, which is \$500,000 less than this year.

*Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.*—An appropriation of \$70,000,000 is recommended for hospital construction, a reduction of \$5,000,000 in the budget estimate. The total replacement and modernization plan is for a \$900,000,000 program over a 12-year period. The 1962 program includes funds for construction of replacement hospitals at Wood, Wisconsin, and Charleston, South Carolina, and technical services for hospital replacements at Atlanta, Georgia, and the Los Angeles, California, area. Construction funds are also included for sixteen modernization projects, technical services for four others, and minor improvements at many other locations. Funds requested for the incorporation of fallout shelters in projects have been deleted.

*Loan guarantee revolving fund.*—The Committee has included language for this fund in the bill and limited the amount that may be applied to the program to \$120,624,000 as set forth in the budget. This fund will finance costs, other than administrative expenses, for the loan guarantee program. Next year the Committee will expect a more detailed accounting of the elements of cost to be financed from this fund.

## LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 3, in connection with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:

*: Provided, That the foregoing amount shall be available for not to exceed 303 positions in the District of Columbia area*

On page 6, in connection with the Civil Aeronautics Board:

*, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year*

On page 9, in connection with the Civil Service Commission:

*: Provided, That the Civil Service Commission shall include annually, in its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget, estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts paid out of the fund by reason of the enactment of Public Law 85-465, and the Bureau of the Budget shall submit annually to the Congress estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the fund for such amounts.*

On pages 10 and 11, in connection with the Federal Aviation Agency:

*: Provided, That total costs of aviation medicine research for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed \$1,500,000 or include in excess of 120 positions*

On page 11, in connection with the Federal Aviation Agency:

*: Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel.*

On page 17, in connection with the General Services Administration:

*Customs and appraisers warehouse, Long Beach area, California, \$2,000,000;*

On page 22, in connection with the General Services Administration:

*: Provided further, That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held pursuant to the aforesaid Acts provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government*

On page 23, in connection with the General Services Administration:

*: Provided further, That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.*

On page 26, in connection with the General Services Administration:

*(b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Administration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing, directly or indirectly, such suitable general purpose space as may be required by any such department or agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.*

On page 27, in connection with the Housing and Home Finance Agency:

*, urban planning financed through grants to State and local government agencies pursuant to title VII of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and reserves of planned public works financed through advances to municipalities and other public agencies pursuant to title VII of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended*

On pages 37 and 38, in connection with the Veterans Administration:

*: Provided, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for technical services for replacement of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tennessee, is reduced from "\$1,500,000" to "\$921,600".*



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1961 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS  
RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1962

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

| Item   | Appropriation<br>estimate, 1961 | Budget estimate,<br>1962 | Increase (+) or<br>decrease (—) |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act-----                              | \$67,000                        | \$57,000                 | --\$10,000                      |
| General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property----- | 2,000,000                       | 2,000,000                | -----                           |
| Veterans' Administration: Veterans insurance and indemnities-----                                      | 650,000                         | 655,000                  | +5,000                          |
| Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations-----  | 2,717,000                       | 2,712,000                | --5,000                         |

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January, 1961, budget document for 1962. Some of items subject to further revision.

# ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

21

| Corporation or agency  | Authorization,<br>1961 | Budget<br>estimates,<br>1962 | Recommended<br>in bill | Bill compared with—      |                   |
|--|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
|  |                        |                              |                        | 1961 author-<br>izations | 1962<br>estimates |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board:                                  |                        |                              |                        |                          |                   |
| Administrative expenses-----                                   | (\$2,071,000)          | (\$1,725,000)                | (\$1,725,000)          | (-\$346,000)             | -----             |
| Nonadministrative expenses-----                                | (8,819,000)            | (10,366,000)                 | (10,366,000)           | (+1,547,000)             | -----             |
| Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation                 | (857,000)              | (890,000)                    | (890,000)              | (+33,000)                | -----             |
| General Services Administration:                               |                        |                              |                        |                          |                   |
| Federal Facilities Corporation-----                            | (20,000)               | -----                        | -----                  | (-20,000)                | -----             |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation<br>Fund-----    | (43,000)               | (42,500)                     | (42,500)               | (-500)                   | -----             |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency:                               |                        |                              |                        |                          |                   |
| College housing loans-----                                     | (1,580,000)            | <sup>1</sup> (2,100,000)     | (1,900,000)            | (+320,000)               | (-\$200,000)      |
| Public facility loans-----                                     | (537,500)              | <sup>1</sup> (750,000)       | (650,000)              | (+112,500)               | (-100,000)        |
| Revolving fund (liquidating programs)-----                     | (148,500)              | (150,000)                    | (145,000)              | (-3,500)                 | (-5,000)          |
| Federal National Mortgage Association-----                     | (6,900,000)            | (7,450,000)                  | (7,400,000)            | (+500,000)               | (-50,000)         |
| Federal Housing Administration:                                |                        |                              |                        |                          |                   |
| Administrative expenses-----                                   | (9,011,000)            | (9,675,000)                  | (9,600,000)            | (+589,000)               | (-75,000)         |
| Nonadministrative expenses-----                                | (52,988,000)           | (62,300,000)                 | (58,000,000)           | (+5,012,000)             | (-4,300,000)      |
| Public Housing Administration:                                 |                        |                              |                        |                          |                   |
| Administrative expenses-----                                   | (13,868,000)           | (14,150,000)                 | (13,968,000)           | (+100,000)               | (-182,000)        |
| Nonadministrative expenses-----                                | (1,200,000)            | (1,200,000)                  | (1,200,000)            | -----                    | -----             |
| Total, administrative and nonadministra-<br>tive expenses----- | (98,043,000)           | (110,798,500)                | (105,886,500)          | (+7,843,500)             | (-4,912,000)      |

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$150,000 contained in H. Doc. 157.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1962*

| Item  | Appropriations, 1961<br>(to date) | Budget estimates, 1962 | Recommended in bill for 1962 | Bill compared with— |                |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
|   |                                   |                        |                              | 1961 appropriations | 1962 estimates |
| TITLE I   |                                   |                        |                              |                     |                |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT   |                                   |                        |                              |                     |                |
| National Aeronautics and Space Council.....                               |                                   | \$320, 000             | \$320, 000                   | +\$320, 000         |                |
| OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION                                  |                                   |                        |                              |                     |                |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | \$25, 346, 000                    | 30, 500, 000           | 25, 000, 000                 | —346, 000           | —\$5, 500, 000 |
| Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies..... | 6, 567, 000                       | 8, 700, 000            | 6, 567, 000                  |                     | —2, 133, 000   |
| Federal contributions.....  | 16, 000, 000                      | 22, 000, 000           | 22, 000, 000                 | +6, 000, 000        |                |
| Emergency supplies and equipment.....                                     | 9, 175, 000                       | 36, 000, 000           | 21, 600, 000                 | +12, 425, 000       | —14, 400, 000  |
| Research and development.....   | 4, 000, 000                       | 4, 500, 000            | 1, 500, 000                  | —2, 500, 000        | —3, 000, 000   |
| Construction of facilities.....   |                                   | 2, 500, 000            | 2, 500, 000                  | +2, 500, 000        |                |
| Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....                      | 61, 088, 000                      | 104, 200, 000          | 79, 167, 000                 | +18, 079, 000       | —25, 033, 000  |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT                                       |                                   |                        |                              |                     |                |
| Disaster relief.....  |                                   | 6, 000, 000            | 6, 000, 000                  | +6, 000, 000        |                |



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

|                                     |              |               |              |              |              |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Salaries and expenses-----          | 7, 852, 500  | 2 9, 050, 000 | 8, 900, 000  | +1, 047, 500 | -150, 000    |
| Payments to air carriers-----       | 82, 500, 000 | 81, 700, 000  | 74, 800, 000 | -7, 700, 000 | -6, 900, 000 |
| Total, Civil Aeronautics Board----- | 90, 352, 500 | 90, 750, 000  | 83, 700, 000 | -6, 652, 500 | -7, 050, 000 |

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

|   |              |               |               |                |              |
|---|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Salaries and expenses-----  | 20, 761, 000 | 21, 829, 000  | 21, 029, 000  | +268, 000      | -800, 000    |
| Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations----- | 462, 000     | 438, 000      | 430, 000      | -32, 000       | -8, 000      |
| Annuities under special acts-----   | 2, 316, 000  | 2, 248, 000   | 2, 248, 000   | -68, 000       | -----        |
| Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund-----            | 2, 500, 000  | 5, 450, 000   | 4, 500, 000   | +2, 000, 000   | -950, 000    |
| Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund-----              | 1, 625, 000  | 20, 900, 000  | 19, 000, 000  | +17, 375, 000  | -1, 900, 000 |
| Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund-----                      | 46, 329, 000 | 44, 637, 000  | 44, 637, 000  | -1, 692, 000   | -----        |
| Administrative expenses, employees health benefits fund (limitation)-----         | -----        | (1, 148, 000) | (1, 000, 000) | (+1, 000, 000) | (-148, 000)  |
| Administrative expenses, Employees Life Insurance Fund (limitation)-----          | (260, 000)   | (262, 000)    | (260, 000)    | -----          | (-2, 000)    |
| Total, Civil Service Commission-----  | 73, 993, 000 | 95, 502, 000  | 91, 844, 000  | +17, 851, 000  | -3, 658, 000 |

<sup>1</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 158.<sup>2</sup> Includes \$100,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1962—Continued*

| Item   | Appropriations, 1961<br>(to date) | Budget<br>estimates,<br>1962 | Recommended<br>in bill for<br>1962 | Bill compared with— |                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
|  |                                   |                              |                                    | 1961 appropriations | 1962<br>estimates |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued  |                                   |                              |                                    |                     |                   |
| FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY  |                                   |                              |                                    |                     |                   |
| Operations.....  | \$388, 164, 000                   | \$441, 000, 000              | \$428, 000, 000                    | +\$39, 836, 000     | —\$13, 000, 000   |
| Facilities and equipment.....  | 164, 600, 000                     | 126, 000, 000                | 120, 000, 000                      | —44, 600, 000       | —6, 000, 000      |
| Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract<br>authorization)..... | 80, 000, 000                      | 70, 000, 000                 | 70, 000, 000                       | —10, 000, 000       | -----             |
| Research and development.....  | 64, 480, 000                      | 65, 000, 000                 | 60, 000, 000                       | —4, 480, 000        | —5, 000, 000      |
| Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports.....                  | -----                             | 6, 000, 000                  | -----                              | -----               | —6, 000, 000      |
| Operation and maintenance, Washington National<br>Airport.....             | 3, 230, 000                       | -----                        | 3, 225, 000                        | —5, 000             | +3, 225, 000      |
| Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Air-<br>port.....          | 2, 450, 000                       | -----                        | 1, 975, 000                        | —475, 000           | +1, 975, 000      |
| Construction, Washington National Airport.....                             | 4, 500, 000                       | 4, 200, 000                  | 4, 200, 000                        | —300, 000           | -----             |
| Construction and development, additional Wash-<br>ington Airport.....      | -----                             | <sup>3</sup> 20, 100, 000    | 26, 100, 000                       | +26, 100, 000       | +6, 000, 000      |
| Civil supersonic aircraft development.....                                 | -----                             | <sup>4</sup> 12, 000, 000    | 10, 000, 000                       | +10, 000, 000       | —2, 000, 000      |
| Total, Federal Aviation Agency.....  | 707, 424, 000                     | 744, 300, 000                | 723, 500, 000                      | +16, 076, 000       | —20, 800, 000     |

|  |               |                |               |               |               |
|--|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  |               |                |               |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----   | 13, 789, 000  | 12, 525, 000   | 12, 400, 000  | -1, 389, 000  | -125, 000     |
| FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION   |               |                |               |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----   | 8, 163, 500   | 8, 793, 000    | 8, 793, 000   | + 629, 500    | -----         |
| FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION   |               |                |               |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----   | 8, 009, 500   | * 10, 690, 000 | 10, 000, 000  | +1, 990, 500  | -690, 000     |
| GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE  |               |                |               |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----   | 42, 179, 000  | 43, 000, 000   | 43, 000, 000  | + 821, 000    | -----         |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION  |               |                |               |               |               |
| Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service-----                          | 169, 992, 000 | 176, 000, 000  | 170, 000, 000 | + 8, 000      | -6, 000, 000  |
| Repair and improvement of public buildings-----                            | 58, 000, 000  | 60, 000, 000   | 58, 000, 000  | -----         | -2, 000, 000  |
| Construction, public buildings projects-----                               | 165, 441, 000 | 181, 325, 000  | 171, 600, 000 | +6, 159, 000  | -9, 725, 000  |
| Sites and expenses, public buildings projects-----                         | 21, 000, 000  | 5, 000, 000    | 25, 000, 000  | +4, 000, 000  | +20, 000, 000 |
| Payments, public buildings purchase contracts-----                         | 4, 000, 000   | 5, 200, 000    | 5, 200, 000   | +1, 200, 000  | -----         |
| Construction, Federal office building numbered 7,<br>Washington, D.C.----- | -----         | 26, 175, 000   | 23, 700, 000  | +23, 700, 000 | -2, 475, 000  |
| Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service-----                            | 4, 422, 000   | 3, 737, 000    | 3, 450, 000   | -972, 000     | -287, 000     |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts-----                                  | (3, 243, 500) | (3, 935, 000)  | (3, 935, 000) | (+ 691, 500)  | -----         |
| Expenses, supply distribution-----   | 24, 425, 000  | * 29, 374, 000 | 27, 375, 000  | + 2, 950, 000 | -1, 999, 000  |

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$16,300,000 contained in H. Doc. 129,

<sup>4</sup> Contains in H. Doc. No. 129,

<sup>5</sup> Includes \$1,050,000 contained in H. Doc. 156.

<sup>6</sup> Includes \$1,800,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.



*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1962—Continued*

| Item   | Appropriations, 1961<br>(to date) | Budget estimates, 1962    | Recommended in bill for 1962 | Bill compared with-- |                |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
|  |                                   |                           |                              | 1961 appropriations  | 1962 estimates |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued  |                                   |                           |                              |                      |                |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—Continued                            |                                   |                           |                              |                      |                |
| General supply fund-----   | \$20,000,000                      | \$8,000,000               | \$4,000,000                  | -\$16,000,000        | -\$4,000,000   |
| Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service-----       | 10,179,000                        | 14,159,000                | 14,000,000                   | +3,821,000           | -159,000       |
| Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service----- | 2,536,000                         | 2,500,000                 | 2,475,000                    | -61,000              | -25,000        |
| Strategic and critical materials-----                                | 26,235,000                        | 40,000,000                | 30,000,000                   | +3,765,000           | -10,000,000    |
| Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator-----                  | 247,000                           | 250,000                   | 290,000                      | +43,000              | +40,000        |
| Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents-----          | 250,000                           | 300,000                   | 300,000                      | +50,000              | -----          |
| Refunds under Renegotiation Act-----                                 | 2,500,000                         | -----                     | -----                        | -2,500,000           | -----          |
| Administrative operations fund (limitation)-----                     | (14,113,200)                      | <sup>7</sup> (14,864,000) | (14,268,900)                 | (+155,700)           | (-595,100)     |
| Working capital fund-----  | -----                             | 150,000                   | -----                        | -----                | -150,000       |
| Total, General Services Administration-----                          | 509,227,000                       | 552,170,000               | 535,390,000                  | +26,163,000          | -16,780,000    |

## HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

## Office of the Administrator:

|   |               |                 |               |               |               |
|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Salaries and expenses.....                                      | 11, 015, 000  | 8 13, 150, 000  | 12, 900, 000  | +1, 885, 000  | -250, 000     |
| Urban planning grants.....                                      | 4, 000, 000   | 10, 000, 000    | 3, 600, 000   | -400, 000     | -6, 400, 000  |
| Public works planning fund.....                                 | 6, 000, 000   | 10 8, 000, 000  | 6, 000, 000   | -----         | -2, 000, 000  |
| Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization)..... | 150, 000, 000 | 200, 000, 000   | 200, 000, 000 | +50, 000, 000 | -----         |
| Urban studies and housing research.....                         | -----         | 9 900, 000      | 450, 000      | +450, 000     | -450, 000     |
| Housing for the elderly fund.....                               | 20, 000, 000  | 11 30, 000, 000 | 25, 000, 000  | +5, 000, 000  | -5, 000, 000  |
| Total, Office of the Administrator.....                         | 191, 015, 000 | 262, 050, 000   | 247, 950, 000 | +56, 935, 000 | -14, 100, 000 |
| Public Housing Administration:                                  |               |                 |               |               |               |
| Annual contributions.....                                       | 140, 000, 000 | 169, 300, 000   | 165, 000, 000 | +25, 000, 000 | -4, 300, 000  |
| Administrative expenses.....                                    | 13, 868, 000  | 14, 150, 000    | 13, 968, 000  | +100, 000     | -182, 000     |
| Total, Public Housing Administration.....                       | 153, 868, 000 | 183, 450, 000   | 178, 968, 000 | +25, 100, 000 | -4, 482, 000  |
| Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency.....                     | 344, 883, 000 | 445, 500, 000   | 426, 918, 000 | +82, 035, 000 | -18, 582, 000 |
| INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION                                  |               |                 |               |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                      | 21, 451, 500  | 22, 200, 000    | 21, 950, 000  | +498, 500     | -250, 000     |

<sup>7</sup> Includes \$257,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.<sup>8</sup> Includes \$750,000 contained in H. Doc. 157.<sup>9</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 157.<sup>10</sup> Includes \$4,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 157.<sup>11</sup> Includes \$30,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 157.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1962—Continued*

| Item  | Appropriations, 1961<br>(to date) | Budget estimates, 1962      | Recommended in bill for 1962 | Bill compared with-- |                |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
|   |                                   |                             |                              | 1961 appropriations  | 1962 estimates |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES--Continued                                |                                   |                             |                              |                      |                |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION                 |                                   |                             |                              |                      |                |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                    | \$170, 760, 000                   | <sup>12</sup> \$196,686,000 | \$191, 750, 000              | +\$20, 990, 000      | -\$4, 936, 000 |
| Research and development.....                                 | 670, 453, 000                     | <sup>13</sup> 919, 539, 000 | 892, 000, 000                | +221, 547, 000       | -27, 539, 000  |
| Construction of facilities.....                               | 122, 787, 000                     | <sup>14</sup> 119, 075, 000 | 116, 250, 000                | -6, 537, 000         | -2, 825, 000   |
| Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....     | 964, 000, 000                     | 1, 235, 300, 000            | 1, 200, 000, 000             | +236, 000, 000       | -35, 300, 000  |
| NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY                            |                                   |                             |                              |                      |                |
| Operation and maintenance of properties.....                  | 40, 000                           | 40, 000                     | 40, 000                      | -----                | -----          |
| NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION                                   |                                   |                             |                              |                      |                |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                    | 175, 800, 000                     | <sup>15</sup> 275, 000, 000 | 250, 000, 000                | +74, 200, 000        | -25, 000, 000  |
| Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)..... | ( <sup>16</sup> )                 | 2, 000, 000                 | ( <sup>16</sup> )            | -----                | -2, 000, 000   |
| Total, National Science Foundation.....                       | 175, 800, 000                     | 277, 000, 000               | 250, 000, 000                | +74, 200, 000        | -27, 000, 000  |



|  |                  |                                |                  |                 |                |
|--|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| RENEGOTIATION BOARD  |                  |                                |                  |                 |                |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                       | 3, 015, 000      | 3, 000, 000                    | 2, 900, 000      | - 115, 000      | - 100, 000     |
| SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION                               |                  |                                |                  |                 |                |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                       | 9, 517, 500      | <sup>17</sup> 11, 015, 000     | 11, 000, 000     | + 1, 482, 500   | - 15, 000      |
| SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM   |                  |                                |                  |                 |                |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                       | 33, 169, 400     | 34, 475, 000                   | 33, 670, 000     | + 500, 600      | - 805, 000     |
| VETERANS ADMINISTRATION  |                  |                                |                  |                 |                |
| General operating expenses-----                                  | 164, 350, 000    | 162, 046, 000                  | 161, 500, 000    | - 2, 850, 000   | - 546, 000     |
| Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses----- | 35, 165, 000     | 15, 053, 000                   | 40, 700, 000     | + 5, 535, 000   | + 25, 647, 000 |
| Medical care-----  | 863, 206, 000    | 1, 009, 171, 000               | 987, 171, 000    | + 123, 965, 000 | - 22, 000, 000 |
| Compensation and pensions-----                                   | 3, 800, 000, 000 | <sup>18</sup> 3, 543, 000, 000 | 3, 500, 000, 000 | - 300, 000, 000 | - 43, 000, 000 |
| Readjustment benefits-----                                       | 344, 000, 000    | 80, 376, 000                   | 80, 000, 000     | - 264, 000, 000 | - 376, 000     |
| Veterans insurance and indemnities-----                          | 48, 800, 000     | 39, 200, 000                   | 39, 200, 000     | - 9, 600, 000   | -----          |
| Grants to the Republic of the Philippines-----                   | 1, 500, 000      | 1, 000, 000                    | 1, 000, 000      | - 500, 000      | -----          |
| Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities-----         | 75, 000, 000     | 75, 000, 000                   | 70, 000, 000     | - 5, 000, 000   | - 5, 000, 000  |
| Loan guarantee revolving fund-----                               |                  | ( <sup>19</sup> )              |                  |                 | -----          |

<sup>12</sup> Includes \$6,700,000 contained in H. Doc. 125.<sup>13</sup> Includes \$99,720,000 contained in H. Doc. 125.<sup>14</sup> Includes \$19,250,000 contained in H. Doc. 125.<sup>15</sup> Includes \$65,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.<sup>16</sup> Not to exceed \$1,600,000 of salaries and expenses made available on a permissive basis.<sup>17</sup> Includes \$100,000 contained in H. Doc. 162.<sup>18</sup> Includes decrease of \$25,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.<sup>19</sup> Indefinite amount by transfer from "Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund."

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1962—Continued*

| Item  | Appropriations, 1961<br>(to date) | Budget<br>estimates,<br>1962 | Recommended<br>in bill for<br>1962 | Bill compared with— |                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
|   |                                   |                              |                                    | 1961 appropriations | 1962<br>estimates |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued                   |                                   |                              |                                    |                     |                   |
| VETERANS ADMINISTRATION—Continued               |                                   |                              |                                    |                     |                   |
| Outpatient care-----                            | \$90, 034, 000                    | ( <sup>20</sup> )            | ( <sup>20</sup> )                  | —\$90, 034, 000     | -----             |
| Maintenance and operation of supply depots----- | 2, 643, 000                       | ( <sup>21</sup> )            | ( <sup>21</sup> )                  | —2, 643, 000        | -----             |
| Total, Veterans Administration-----             | 5, 424, 698, 000                  | \$4,924, 846, 000            | \$4, 879, 571, 000                 | —545, 127, 000      | —\$45, 275, 000   |
| Total, definite appropriations-----             | 8, 490, 799, 900                  | 8, 621, 626, 000             | 8, 420, 163, 000                   | —70, 636, 900       | —201, 463, 000    |
| Total, indefinite appropriations-----           | 3, 243, 500                       | 3, 935, 000                  | 3, 935, 000                        | +691, 500           | -----             |
| Total, title I-----                             | 8, 494, 043, 400                  | 8, 625, 561, 000             | 8, 424, 098, 000                   | —69, 945, 400       | —201, 463, 000    |

<sup>20</sup> Item consolidated with "Medical care."

<sup>21</sup> Expenses to be financed in 1962 through supply fund.

○







Union Calendar No. 175

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 7445

[Report No. 449]

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 2, 1961

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4      in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry in-  
5      dependent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpo-  
6      rations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June  
7      30, 1962, namely:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem, \$320,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

MOBILIZATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense and defense mobilization functions; not to exceed \$3,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and



1 conclusive; and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of  
2 travel; \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount  
3 shall be available for not to exceed 303 positions in the Dis-  
4 trict of Columbia area: *Provided further*, That contracts for  
5 not to exceed two persons under this appropriation for  
6 temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section  
7 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be  
8 renewed annually, and one such contract, for the services of  
9 an expert or consultant for telecommunications, may provide  
10 for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75.

11 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS  
12 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

13 For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies  
14 to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization func-  
15 tions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense  
16 Mobilization, including payments by the Department of  
17 Labor to State employment security agencies for the full  
18 cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization ac-  
19 tivities, \$6,567,000.

20 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

21 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense  
22 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,  
23 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds, \$22,-  
24 000,000, of which not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be avail-

1 able for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of  
2 said Act.

### 3 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

4 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,  
5 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense  
6 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of  
7 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,  
8 \$21,600,000.

### 9 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

10 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
11 studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil  
12 defense and defense mobilization, including evacuation, shel-  
13 ter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by  
14 section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,  
15 as amended, and other law, including services as authorized  
16 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
17 \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

### 18 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

19 For expenses necessary for the design, construction, and  
20 equipment of protected regional facilities for the Office of  
21 Civil and Defense Mobilization, \$2,500,000, to remain avail-  
22 able until expended.

### 23 GENERAL PROVISION

24 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-  
25 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of  
26 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed

1 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense  
2 Mobilization.

3 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

4 DISASTER RELIEF

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
6 Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-  
7 1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local govern-  
8 ments in major disasters, \$6,000,000, to remain available  
9 until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum  
10 of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative  
11 expenses.

12 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

13 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,  
16 including employment of temporary guards on a contract  
17 or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of air-  
18 craft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as  
19 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
20 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100  
21 per diem; \$8,900,000.

22 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT

23 AUTHORIZATION)

24 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-  
25 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board



1 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49  
2 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$74,800,000, of  
3 which not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for subsidy  
4 for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, to  
5 remain available until expended.

## 6 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

### 7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary expenses, including services as authorized  
9 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C.  
10 55a); not to exceed \$10,000 for medical examinations per-  
11 formed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; pay-  
12 ment in advance for library membership in societies whose  
13 publications are available to members only or to members  
14 at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed  
15 \$83,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Com-  
16 mission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reim-  
17 bursement of the General Services Administration for  
18 security guard services for protection of confidential files;  
19 and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial services by contract,  
20 without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as  
21 amended; \$21,029,000: *Provided*, That no part of this ap-  
22 propriation shall be available for the Career Executive  
23 Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4,  
24 1958, as amended.

25 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil



1 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and  
2 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and  
3 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established  
4 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

5 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR  
6 EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

7 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Ex-  
8 ecutive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,  
9 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary  
10 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of  
11 other international organizations, certain information con-  
12 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered  
13 for employment by such organizations, including services  
14 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
15 U.S.C. 55a), \$430,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation  
16 shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the  
17 applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Com-  
18 mission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses  
19 incurred by such agencies under said Executive order:  
20 *Provided further*, That members of the International Organ-  
21 izations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual trans-  
22 portation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence au-  
23 thorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,  
24 while traveling on official business away from their homes  
25 or regular places of business, including periods while en

1 route to and from and at the place where their services are  
 2 to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections  
 3 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section  
 4 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed  
 5 to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time  
 6 or intermittent service as a member of the International Or-  
 7 ganizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service  
 8 Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated  
 9 January 9, 1953, as amended.

#### 10 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

11 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May  
 12 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of  
 13 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),  
 14 \$2,248,000.

#### 15 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

#### 16 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

17 For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund"  
 18 of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as  
 19 authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health  
 20 Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$4,500,000, to remain avail-  
 21 able until expended.

#### 22 GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION, RETIRED EMPLOYEES

#### 23 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

24 For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits  
 25 fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired

1 employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal  
2 Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850),  
3 \$19,000,000.

4 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND  
5 DISABILITY FUND

6 For financing the annuity benefits and increases provided  
7 by the Act of June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$44,637,000,  
8 to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability  
9 fund: *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission shall in-  
10 clude annually, in its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget,  
11 estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the  
12 civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts  
13 paid out of the fund by reason of the enactment of Public  
14 Law 85-465, and the Bureau of the Budget shall submit an-  
15 nually to the Congress estimates of the appropriations neces-  
16 sary to reimburse the fund for such amounts.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES  
18 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

19 Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds in the "Em-  
20 ployees health benefits fund" shall be available for reim-  
21 bursement to the Civil Service Commission for administra-  
22 tive expenses incurred by the Commission during the current  
23 fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees



1 Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 713), including serv-  
2 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
3 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

4 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES  
5 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

6 Not to exceed \$260,000 of the funds in the "Employees  
7 life insurance fund" shall be available for reimbursement to  
8 the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses  
9 incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year  
10 in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life  
11 Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103),  
12 including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act  
13 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a): *Provided*, That this  
14 limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10  
15 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of  
16 Public Law 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c)).

17 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

18 OPERATIONS

19 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,  
20 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses  
21 for research and development and for establishment of air  
22 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the  
23 Federal Airport Act; not to exceed \$10,000 for representa-  
24 tion allowances and for official entertainment; and purchase  
25 and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$428,000,000: *Provided*,  
26 That total costs of aviation medicine research for the Federal



1 Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appro-  
2 priation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed \$1,500,000  
3 or include in excess of 120 positions: *Provided further*, That  
4 there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received  
5 from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities,  
6 and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance  
7 and operation of air navigation facilities.

### 8 FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

9 For an additional amount for the acquisition, establish-  
10 ment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of  
11 air navigation and experimental facilities, including the ini-  
12 tial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the con-  
13 struction and furnishing of quarters and related accommoda-  
14 tions for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation  
15 Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommo-  
16 dations are not available (at a total cost of construction of  
17 not to exceed \$50,000 per housing unit in Alaska) ; and  
18 purchase of nine aircraft; \$120,000,000, to remain  
19 available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be cred-  
20 ited to this appropriation funds received from States, coun-  
21 ties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private  
22 sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air  
23 navigation facilities: *Provided further*, That no part of the  
24 foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construc-  
25 tion of a new wind tunnel.

1       GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF  
2                               CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

3       For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority  
4 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to  
5 enter into contracts, \$70,000,000, to remain available until  
6 expended.

7                               RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

8       For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
9 research, development, and service testing in accordance  
10 with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C.  
11 1301-1542), including construction of experimental facilities  
12 and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$60,000,-  
13 000, to remain available until expended.

14               OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON

15                               NATIONAL AIRPORT

16       For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-  
17 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington Na-  
18 tional Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of  
19 uniforms, and arms and ammunition, \$3,225,000.

20               OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES

21                               INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

22       For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-  
23 nance, improvement and protection of the Dulles Interna-  
24 tional Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of  
25 uniforms, and arms and ammunition, \$1,975,000.

1 CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

2 For necessary expenses for construction at Washington  
3 National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,200,000,  
4 to remain available until expended.

5 CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, ADDITIONAL

6 WASHINGTON AIRPORT

7 For an additional amount for "Construction and develop-  
8 ment, additional Washington airport", \$26,100,000, to re-  
9 main available until expended.

10 CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
12 the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including  
13 advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section  
14 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529),  
15 \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

16 GENERAL PROVISION

17 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations  
18 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the  
19 Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified  
20 in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C.  
21 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Ad-  
22 ministrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance  
23 and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles  
24 and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as au-



1   thorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5  
2   U.S.C. 2131).

### 3       FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

#### 4                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5       For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the  
6   Commission as authorized by law, including land and struc-  
7   tures (not to exceed \$48,000), special counsel fees, improve-  
8   ment and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to  
9   exceed \$15,600), services as authorized by section 15 of the  
10   Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of  
11   not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement  
12   only, \$12,400,000.

### 13       FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

#### 14                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15       For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,  
16   as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor  
17   vehicles and not to exceed \$558,000 for expenses of travel,  
18   \$8,793,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be avail-  
19   able for special counsel and services as authorized by section  
20   15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

### 21       FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

#### 22                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23       For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-  
24   sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized  
25   by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by



1 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
2 \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appro-  
3 priation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter  
4 provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds  
5 are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such  
6 resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

## 7 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

### 8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,  
10 including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries  
11 without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the  
12 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and services  
13 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
14 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$43,000,000.

## 15 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

### 16 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

17 For necessary expenses of real property management  
18 and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings  
19 in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises:  
20 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)  
21 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of  
22 building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and dis-  
23 posal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests there-  
24 in; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of  
25 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); \$170,000,000: *Pro-*

1 *vided*, That this appropriation shall be available, without  
2 regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as  
3 amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or  
4 parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for  
5 “Emergency operating expenses”.

#### 6 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

7 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to  
8 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pur-  
9 suant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479),  
10 including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves  
11 and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent  
12 thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for  
13 public buildings; preliminary planning of projects by con-  
14 tract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition,  
15 and equipment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until ex-  
16 pended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropria-  
17 tion, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings  
18 Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the  
19 Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C.  
20 901 et. seq.), and Public Health Service facilities (except  
21 Indian health facilities), shall be considered to be public  
22 buildings.

#### 23 CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

24 For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise  
25 provided for, necessary to construct public buildings projects  
26 and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where

1 the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000  
2 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat.  
3 479), including equipment for such buildings, \$171,600,-  
4 000, and not to exceed \$500,000 of this amount shall be  
5 available to the Administrator for construction, sites and ex-  
6 penses for small public buildings outside the District of Co-  
7 lumbia as the Administrator approves and deems necessary,  
8 all to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the  
9 foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings  
10 projects at locations and at maximum construction improve-  
11 ment costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as fol-  
12 lows:

13 Post office and Federal office building, Decatur, Ala-  
14 bama, \$1,315,750;

15 Customhouse and Federal office building, Los Angeles,  
16 California, \$27,388,500;

17 Customs and appraisers warehouse, Long Beach area,  
18 California, \$2,000,000;

19 Courthouse and Federal office building, Denver, Colo-  
20 rado, \$18,145,000;

21 Post office and Federal office building, Statesboro,  
22 Georgia, \$538,650, which shall be known as the Prince  
23 H. Preston Building;

24 Post office and Federal office building, Winder, Georgia,  
25 \$475,000;



1 Post office and Federal office building (construction and  
2 alteration), Wyandotte, Michigan, \$402,800;

3 Post office and Federal office building, Santa Fe, New  
4 Mexico, \$2,362,650;

5 Customhouse, courthouse, and Federal office building,  
6 New York, New York, \$59,222,050;

7 Post office and courthouse, Bryson City, North Carolina,  
8 \$753,350;

9 Post office building, Thomasville, North Carolina, \$327,-  
10 750;

11 Border station, Pembina, North Dakota, \$183,350;

12 Federal office building, Cincinnati, Ohio, \$17,432,500;

13 Post office and Federal office building, Medford, Oregon,  
14 \$1,728,050;

15 Post office and Federal office building (construction and  
16 alteration), Johnstown, Pennsylvania, \$1,187,500;

17 Post office and Federal office building, Lebanon, Penn-  
18 sylvania, \$730,550;

19 Border station, Derby Line, Vermont, \$267,900;

20 Government Printing Office field plant, District of Co-  
21 lumbia, \$1,545,650: *Provided further*, That the maximum

22 construction improvement costs heretofore approved for the  
23 following projects are hereby increased as follows:

24 Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of  
25 Columbia, is increased from "\$15,105,000" to "\$18,905,-



000", including \$5,700,000 for laboratory and other equipment;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Chicago, Illinois, is increased from "\$5,500,000" to "\$36,793,000", including construction of the first of two buildings authorized at this location: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum.

#### SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959, 1960 and 1961, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), \$5,200,000.

#### CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7,

#### WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct Federal Office Building

1   Numbered 7 in Washington, District of Columbia, for use  
2   of agencies of the executive branch, in accordance with plans  
3   and specifications provided for in the Independent Offices  
4   Appropriation Acts, 1959 and 1961 (72 Stat. 1067 and 74  
5   Stat. 432) , \$23,700,000, to remain available until expended.

6       OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

7       For necessary expenses of personal property manage-  
8   ment and related activities as authorized by law and not  
9   otherwise provided for, \$3,450,000: *Provided*, That not  
10  to exceed \$3,935,000 of any funds received during the cur-  
11  rent or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204 (a)  
12  of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of  
13  1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law,  
14  shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and shall  
15  be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the func-  
16  tions of the General Services Administration under the said  
17  Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess  
18  and surplus personal property.

19               EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

20       For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for  
21  supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the  
22  stores depot system, and contractual services incident to re-  
23  ceiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items, \$27,-  
24  375,000.

## GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

To increase the general supply fund established by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 630g), \$4,000,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND  
RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, \$14,000,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC  
UTILITIES SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation and public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals, \$2,475,000.

## STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h), during the current fiscal year, for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or trans-



ferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b) ), for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462) , relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is responsible, including reimbursement for security guard services, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) , and not to exceed \$3,000,000 for operating expenses, \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held pursuant to the aforesaid Acts provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e (a) ), may be transferred without reimbursement to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Pro-*



1 *vided further*, That any receipts from sales during the cur-  
 2 rent fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treas-  
 3 ury: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year  
 4 materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense  
 5 Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be available,  
 6 without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value  
 7 to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, proc-  
 8 essing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to sec-  
 9 tion 3 (c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling  
 10 Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

#### 11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

12 For expenses of executive direction for activities under  
 13 the control of the General Services Administration, \$290,-  
 14 000.

#### 15 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER

#### 16 PRESIDENTS

17 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August  
 18 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$300,000: *Provided*, That the Ad-  
 19 ministrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary  
 20 of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out  
 21 the provisions of sections (a) and (c) of such Act.

#### 22 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

23 Funds available to General Services Administration for  
 24 administrative operations, in support of program activities,  
 25 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through

1 a single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That  
2 costs and obligations for such administrative operations for  
3 the respective program activities shall be accounted for in  
4 accordance with systems approved by the General Ac-  
5 counting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount  
6 deposited into said account for the fiscal year 1962 from  
7 funds made available to General Services Administration  
8 in this Act shall not exceed \$14,268,900: *Provided further*,  
9 That amounts deposited into said account for administrative  
10 operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts  
11 included in the respective program appropriations for such  
12 purposes.

### 13 GENERAL PROVISIONS

14 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the  
15 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)  
16 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,  
17 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from  
18 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;  
19 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to  
20 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the  
21 General Services Administration, issued by public authorities,  
22 States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect  
23 to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems  
24 necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request

1 and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from  
2 the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropria-  
3 tions or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to  
4 the General Services Administration, in connection with  
5 property transferred to the General Services Administration  
6 pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff),  
7 and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with  
8 the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

9 Appropriations under the heading "Construction, Public  
10 Buildings Projects" shall be available for (1) acquisition of  
11 buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or  
12 otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2)  
13 extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and  
14 (3) construction of projects for new public buildings ap-  
15 proved pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959, in  
16 addition to those set forth under that appropriation.

17 Funds available to the General Services Administration  
18 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

19 No part of any money appropriated by this or any  
20 other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the  
21 Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for  
22 the purchase within the continental limits of the United  
23 States of any typewriting machines except in accordance



1 with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the  
2 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,  
3 as amended.

4 Appropriations available to any department or agency  
5 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, in-  
6 cluding maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be  
7 available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services  
8 Administration for those expenses of renovation and altera-  
9 tion of buildings and facilities which constitute public im-  
10 provements, performed in accordance with the Public Build-  
11 ings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law,  
12 and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropria-  
13 tions to said Administration for rents and related expenses,  
14 not otherwise provided for, of providing, directly or indi-  
15 rectly, such suitable general purpose space as may be re-  
16 quired by any such department or agency, in the District  
17 of Columbia or elsewhere.

## 18 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### 19 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

#### 20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Adminis-  
22 trator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the  
23 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and purchase of  
24 two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$12,-  
25 900,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of inspections



1 and of providing representatives at the site of projects being  
2 planned or undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to  
3 title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects  
4 financed through loans to educational institutions author-  
5 ized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended,  
6 projects and facilities financed by loans to public agencies  
7 pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as  
8 amended, urban planning financed through grants to State  
9 and local government agencies pursuant to title VII of the  
10 Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and reserves of planned  
11 public works financed through advances to municipalities  
12 and other public agencies pursuant to title VII of the Hous-  
13 ing Act of 1954, as amended, shall be compensated by such  
14 agencies or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in  
15 the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services,  
16 and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadmin-  
17 istrative; and for the purpose of providing such inspections,  
18 the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency  
19 may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from  
20 such institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such  
21 amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such  
22 charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses  
23 shall not exceed \$3,000,000.

#### 24 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

25 For grants in accordance with the provisions of sec-

tion 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$3,600,-  
000.

### PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section  
702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C.  
462), \$6,000,000.

### URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for payment of grants as au-  
thorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended  
(42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$200,000,000.

### URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by  
the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, includ-  
ing administrative expenses in connection therewith,  
\$450,000.

### HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section  
202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$25,000,000: *Provided,*  
That not to exceed \$350,000 of the foregoing amount shall  
be available for administrative expenses during the current  
fiscal year.

### PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

#### ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public  
housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United

1 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),  
2 \$165,000,000.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

4 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing  
5 Administration, \$13,968,000, to be expended under the  
6 authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this  
7 Act.

8 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce  
11 Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the em-  
12 ployment of special counsel; services as authorized by section  
13 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and pur-  
14 chase of not to exceed forty-two passenger motor vehicles of  
15 which thirty-six shall be for replacement only; \$21,950,000,  
16 of which not less than \$1,696,700 shall be available for  
17 expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and  
18 not less than \$1,129,000 shall be available for expenses nec-  
19 essary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Pro-*  
20 *vided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State  
21 commissioners may use Government transportation requests  
22 when traveling in connection with their duties as such.



1 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE  
2 ADMINISTRATION  
3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of  
5 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, includ-  
6 ing not to exceed \$8,000,000 for expenses of travel, and  
7 uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of  
8 September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$191,-  
9 750,000.

10 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

11 For contractual research, development, operations, tech-  
12 nical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction,  
13 and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the  
14 conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and  
15 development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space  
16 Administration, including maintenance and operation of  
17 aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of  
18 fourteen passenger motor vehicles, including one at not to  
19 exceed \$6,000, of which seven shall be for replacement only;  
20 \$892,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,  
21 That no part of this appropriation shall be available for pay-  
22 ment of salaries of National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-  
23 tration personnel.



## CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$116,250,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be available for emergency construction of facilities in accord with section 3 of the legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year 1962, to remain available until expended.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation shall not be thereby increased.

Not to exceed \$15,000 of appropriations in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for such scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense as may be authorized by law.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales,

1 leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury  
2 of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so  
3 long as funds are available from appropriations for the  
4 foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the  
5 Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Con-  
6 gress), shall not be effective.

## 7 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### 8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
10 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42  
11 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellow-  
12 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
13 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire of passenger motor  
14 vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Admin-  
15 istration for security guard services; \$250,000,000, to re-  
16 main available until expended: *Provided*, That of the fore-  
17 going amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be available  
18 for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a  
19 program of supplementary training for secondary school  
20 science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That  
21 not to exceed \$1,600,000 of the foregoing appropriation  
22 may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue  
23 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
24 Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for  
25 the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act.

## 1                    RENEGOTIATION BOARD

## 2                    SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3            For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-  
4 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as  
5 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
6 U.S.C. 55a) , \$2,900,000.

## 7                    SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

## 8                    SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9            For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-  
10 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) , and  
11 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
12 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) , \$11,000,000.

## 13                    SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

## 14                    SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15            For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-  
16 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I  
17 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62  
18 Stat. 604) , as amended, including services as authorized by  
19 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ;  
20 not to exceed \$62,000 for the National Selective Service Ap-  
21 peal Board; and \$19,000 for the National Advisory Commit-  
22 tee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Spe-  
23 cialists; \$33,670,000: *Provided*, That during the current  
24 fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation  
25 from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the



1 Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such  
2 action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

3 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

4 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

5 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-  
6 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses  
7 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-  
8 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; and  
9 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
10 security guard service; \$161,500,000: *Provided*, That no  
11 part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of  
12 twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Pro-*  
13 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be  
14 used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifi-  
15 cations of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a  
16 rate in excess of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran en-  
17 rolled in and attending such institution.

18 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

19 OPERATING EXPENSES

20 For expenses necessary for administration of the medi-  
21 cal, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research,  
22 employee education and training activities, and expenses nec-  
23 essary for carrying out programs of medical research, as  
24 authorized by law, \$40,700,000, of which \$27,000,000 shall



1 be available for medical research: *Provided*, That \$1,-  
2 000,000 of the foregoing appropriations shall remain avail-  
3 able until expended for prosthetic testing and development.

#### 4 MEDICAL CARE

5 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-  
6 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as  
7 authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treat-  
8 ment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration includ-  
9 ing care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction  
10 of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational  
11 articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms;  
12 repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the  
13 several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the  
14 Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either  
15 by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and  
16 purchase of materials; purchase of seventy-two passenger  
17 motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances  
18 therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid  
19 to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,  
20 United States Code; \$987,171,000, plus reimbursements:  
21 *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from  
22 this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education,  
23 and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy,  
24 and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them

1 under the various headings of their applicable appropriations,  
2 of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment  
3 of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

4 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

5 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,  
6 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-  
7 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence al-  
8 lowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any  
9 Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon,  
10 including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities,  
11 the administration of which is now or may hereafter be  
12 placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment  
13 of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and  
14 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, \$3,500,000,-  
15 000, to remain available until expended.

16 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

17 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans  
18 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment  
19 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and  
20 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-  
21 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38,  
22 United States Code, \$80,000,000, to remain available un-  
23 til expended.





1 Nashville, Tennessee, is reduced from “\$1,500,000” to  
2 “\$921,600”.

3 LOAN GUARANTEE REVOLVING FUND

4 During the current fiscal year, the Loan guarantee  
5 revolving fund shall be available for expenses, but not to  
6 exceed \$120,624,000, for property acquisitions and other  
7 loan guarantee and insurance operations under Chapter 37,  
8 Title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses,  
9 as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That  
10 the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and  
11 reserves revolving fund shall be available, during the current  
12 fiscal year, for transfer to said Loan guarantee revolving  
13 fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the  
14 foregoing expenses.

15 SUPPLY FUND

16 During the current fiscal year, the Supply fund shall be  
17 available for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

19 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the  
20 current fiscal year for “Compensation and pensions”, “Read-  
21 justment benefits”, and “Veterans insurance and indemn-  
22 ties” may be transferred to any other of the mentioned ap-  
23 propriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-  
24 priations so augmented.

25 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-  
26 tion for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall

1 be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the  
2 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

3 The appropriation available to the Veterans Adminis-  
4 tration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall  
5 be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental  
6 thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of  
7 title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Vet-  
8 erans Administration receiving care under such appropria-  
9 tions.

10 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-  
11 erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Con-  
12 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be  
13 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the con-  
14 struction of any new hospital or home.

15 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-  
16 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except  
17 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits  
18 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ap-  
19 propriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administra-  
20 tor of Veterans Affairs.

## 21 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-  
23 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-  
24 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel  
25 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in

1 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*  
2 *vided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed  
3 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards  
4 of the Selective Service System, or to travel performed in  
5 connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the  
6 Civil Aeronautics Board.

7 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in  
8 this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person  
9 filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly  
10 held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces  
11 of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his  
12 period of active military or naval service and has within  
13 ninety days after his release from such service or from hos-  
14 pitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not  
15 more than one year made application for restoration to his  
16 former position and has been certified by the Civil Service  
17 Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his  
18 former position and has not been restored thereto.

19 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available  
20 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase  
21 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new  
22 offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this  
23 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been ap-  
24 proved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.



## TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1962 for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

## FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

## LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Not to exceed a total of \$1,725,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals, and shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal

1 years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment  
2 for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the  
3 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan In-  
4 surance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government  
5 (including payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all  
6 necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship  
7 of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan In-  
8 surance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-  
9 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan  
10 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act  
11 and all necessary expenses (including services performed  
12 on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal  
13 services) in connection with the handling, including the  
14 purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Fed-  
15 eral home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement  
16 of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the  
17 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-  
18 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes  
19 hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates  
20 of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be  
21 entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by  
22 the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance  
23 at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council  
24 and may be paid not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of  
25 subsistence: *Provided further*, That expenses of any func-

1 tions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks)  
2 vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as  
3 nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That, not-  
4 withstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for  
5 the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the admin-  
6 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall  
7 be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the pro-  
8 visions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22,  
9 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449) : *Provided fur-*  
10 *ther*, That the nonadministrative expenses (except those  
11 included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and  
12 examination of Federal and State chartered institutions  
13 (other than special examinations determined by the Board  
14 to be necessary) shall not exceed \$10,366,000.

15 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL  
16 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

17 Not to exceed \$890,000 shall be available for adminis-  
18 trative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall  
19 be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capital-  
20 ized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation  
21 of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of pro-  
22 ceedings under section 407 of the National Housing Act,  
23 liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured  
24 institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward  
25 the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the



1 case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and pay-  
2 ments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board  
3 determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said  
4 Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make  
5 payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan  
6 banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan  
7 Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Pro-*  
8 *vided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act,  
9 except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified,  
10 the administrative expenses and other obligations of said  
11 Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance  
12 with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12  
13 U.S.C. 1724-1730a).

14 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION  
15 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-  
16 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION  
17 FUND

18 Not to exceed \$42,500 (to be computed on an accrual  
19 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of  
20 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General  
21 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1  
22 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the cur-  
23 rent fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the  
24 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein  
25 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to in-

1 clude all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-  
2 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including  
3 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative  
4 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of serv-  
5 ices performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with  
6 the termination of contracts or in the performance of legal  
7 services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of admin-  
8 istrative expenses to the account shall be made in accord-  
9 ance with generally recognized accounting principles and  
10 practices.

## 11 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### 12 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF 13 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

14 Not to exceed \$1,900,000 shall be available for all ad-  
15 ministrative expenses of carrying out the functions of the Ad-  
16 ministrator under the program of housing loans to educa-  
17 tional institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as  
18 amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall be  
19 exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal  
20 Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-  
21 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the  
22 Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation  
23 (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264)  
24 which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury  
25 as a depository of public money of the United States.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
2 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

3 Not to exceed \$650,000 of funds in the revolving fund  
4 established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments  
5 of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative  
6 expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for  
7 services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any  
8 member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any in-  
9 sured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Fed-  
10 eral Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23,  
11 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been desig-  
12 nated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of  
13 public money of the United States.

14 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
15 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-  
16 ING PROGRAMS)

17 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$145,000  
18 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this  
19 amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case  
20 of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Gov-  
21 ernment and legal services on a contract or fee basis and  
22 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve  
23 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the  
24 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-  
25 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the



1 Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal  
2 Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has  
3 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-  
4 pository of public money of the United States.

5 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL  
6 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

7 Not to exceed \$7,400,000 shall be available for admin-  
8 istrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and  
9 shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including ex-  
10 penses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or  
11 fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of  
12 securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures,  
13 fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services  
14 performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not  
15 including other personal services) in connection with the  
16 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improve-  
17 ment, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to  
18 said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries,  
19 wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed out-  
20 side of the continental United States, expenses of services  
21 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the  
22 performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses  
23 reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said As-  
24 sociation may utilize and may make payment for services  
25 and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies

1 of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of ad-  
2 ministrative expenses to the accounts of the Association  
3 shall be made in accordance with generally recognized ac-  
4 counting principles and practices.

5 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-  
6 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

7 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-  
8 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$9,600,000  
9 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration  
10 shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing  
11 Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or  
12 allowances therefore, as authorized by the Act of September  
13 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) : *Provided*, That funds  
14 shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to ex-  
15 ceed \$1,500) : *Provided further*, That nonadministrative ex-  
16 penses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2  
17 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all  
18 appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing  
19 shall not exceed \$58,000,000.

20 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-  
21 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

22 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-  
23 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the admin-  
24 istrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in

1 carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act  
2 of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433), including  
3 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by  
4 the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) :  
5 *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representa-  
6 tives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal proj-  
7 ects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal  
8 projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Ad-  
9 ministration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the  
10 payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to  
11 the development costs of such projects will cover the costs  
12 of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Ad-  
13 ministration for such purpose shall be considered nonad-  
14 ministrative expenses, and funds received from such pay-  
15 ments may be used only for the payment of necessary ex-  
16 penses of providing representatives of the Administration  
17 at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That  
18 all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not spe-  
19 cifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties im-  
20 posed by law, shall not exceed \$1,200,000.

### 21 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in  
23 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any



1 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for  
2 publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or  
3 defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

4 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in  
5 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
6 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to  
7 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel  
8 work in excess of the number that would be provided by a  
9 ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five,  
10 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent em-  
11 ployees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*,  
12 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-  
13 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend halftime  
14 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction  
15 and administration of the personnel program; employment,  
16 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;  
17 employee relations and services; wage administration; and  
18 processing, recording, and reporting.

19 SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in  
20 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
21 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for  
22 construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or  
23 leased buildings except where specifically provided.

24 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Ap-  
25 propriation Act, 1962".

## INDEX

---

|   | Page   |
|---|--------|
| Civil Aeronautics Board.....                        | 5      |
| Civil and Defense Mobilization, Office of.....      | 2      |
| Civil Service Commission.....                       | 6      |
| Disaster relief.....                                | 5      |
| Federal Aviation Agency.....                        | 10     |
| Federal Communications Commission.....              | 14     |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....                   | 41     |
| Federal Power Commission.....                       | 14     |
| Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation..... | 43     |
| Federal Trade Commission.....                       | 14     |
| General Accounting Office.....                      | 15     |
| General Services Administration.....                | 15, 44 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency.....                | 26, 45 |
| Federal National Mortgage Association.....          | 47     |
| Federal Housing Administration.....                 | 48     |
| Public Housing Administration.....                  | 28, 48 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission.....                 | 29     |
| National Aeronautics and Space Council.....         | 2      |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....  | 30     |
| National Capital Housing Authority.....             | 31     |
| National Science Foundation.....                    | 32     |
| Renegotiation Board.....                            | 33     |
| Securities and Exchange Commission.....             | 33     |
| Selective Service System.....                       | 33     |
| Veterans Administration.....                        | 34     |
| General provisions.....                             | 39, 49 |

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

**H. R. 7445**

[Report No. 449]

---

# A BILL

---

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. THOMAS .

---

JUNE 2, 1961

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department  
Staff Only)

Issued June 7, 1961  
For actions of June 6, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 94

## CONTENTS

### Agricultural

|                            |       |
|----------------------------|-------|
| appropriations.....        | 1     |
| Appropriations.1,2,6,13,25 |       |
| Conservation corps.....    | 12    |
| Education.....             | 5     |
| Experiment stations.....   | 21    |
| Farm program.....          | 9,19  |
| Forest Service.....        | 6     |
| Housing.....               | 7,13  |
| Income tax.....            | 20    |
| Legislative program.....   | 13    |
| National parks.....        | 14    |
| Peace Corps.....           | 11,24 |
| Personnel.....             | 20    |
| Property.....              | 10,22 |
| Purchasing.....            | 26    |
| Recreation.....            | 21    |

|                        |    |
|------------------------|----|
| Research.....          | 21 |
| Rural counties.....    | 23 |
| Soil conservation..... | 16 |
| Subsidies.....         | 17 |
| Textiles.....          | 16 |
| Transportation.....    | 27 |
| Virgin Islands.....    | 4  |
| Water resources.....   | 8  |
| Wildlife.....          | 18 |
| Wool.....              | 3  |

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed agricultural appropriation bill. Senate began debate on Interior appropriation bill. House subcommittee voted to report bill to extend Wool Act. Senate debated housing bill.

## HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. By a vote of 318 to 65, passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 7444. pp. 8912-61

### Agreed to the following amendments:

By Rep. Fisher to provide that the Secretary may acquire approximately thirty-five acres of land at Kerrville, Texas, by donation, for research purposes. p. 8953

By Rep. Reuss, 107 to 65, to reduce the advance authorization for the agricultural conservation program from \$250 million to \$150 million (pp. 8953-6). This amendment was later rejected by a roll call vote of 196 to 184 (pp. 8959-60).

### Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Reuss, 98 to 26, to eliminate the provision in the ACP language which prohibits changing the eligibility requirements or cost-sharing practices in the 1962 program from those which were in existence in the 1958 or 1959 program. pp. 8956-7

By Rep. Hoffman to eliminate the \$1 million for the library. pp. 8957-8

A point of order by Rep. Hoffman was sustained against the provision for salaries and expenses for the centennial observance of Agriculture on the basis that it constituted legislation on an appropriation bill, so the provision was struck from the bill. p. 8957



A point of order by Rep. Whitten was sustained against a proposed amendment by Rep. Avery to provide that no funds appropriated shall be used to process CCC loans which are in excess of \$50,000, so the amendment was not considered. pp. 8958-9

2. APPROPRIATIONS. As reported (see Digest 93), the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 7445, includes items for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and Veterans Administration. The committee report includes statements as follows:

"Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.--The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,567,000 for allocation to other Federal agencies for carrying out delegations of authority from OCDM. This is a reduction of \$2,133,000 in the \$8,700,000 budget estimate and is the same amount as was provided for this purpose in 1961. It will support an average of 498 jobs in other agencies, which are in addition to the 1,600 in OCDM.

"Disaster relief.--The Committee has included the \$6,000,000 budget estimate for assistance to States and local governments in coping with major disasters as authorized by Public Law 875, 81st Congress. The unobligated balance is presently \$5,400,000 and it is estimated that it will be down to \$4,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year. The recommended appropriation will restore the fund to \$10,000,000 which is considered a minimum balance at the beginning of a fiscal year for this purpose.

"Increased payments from civil service retirement and disability fund for retired employees.--The Committee has approved the budget estimate of \$44,637,000 to reimburse the retirement fund for the 1962 cost of annuity increases provided to certain retired employees by Public Law 85-465. Legislation is pending to make the increased annuity rates permanent without being dependent on annual appropriations. The Committee wholeheartedly supports the legislation, but funds should be appropriated annually to reimburse the fund for the added expense because the fund is now \$32 billion insolvent. Language is included in the bill to require that the Bureau of the Budget submit annually to the Congress estimates of the appropriations necessary to make such reimbursement. The Committee on other occasions has expressed its concern about the fund's insolvency as the deficiency continues to increase."

3. WOOL. The Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 3680, to extend the National Wool Act of 1954. p. D417
4. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Both Houses received from Interior a proposed bill "to amend section 17(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands pertaining to the salary of the Government Comptroller;" to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. pp. 8837, 8972
5. EDUCATION. Rep. Goodell inserted his minority views opposing H. R. 7300, to authorize a 3 year program of Federal aid to schools. pp. 8965-7

# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department  
Staff Only)

### CONTENTS

Issued June 8, 1961  
For actions of June 7, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 95

Appropriations.....1,12,25  
Assistant Secretary.....13  
Centennials.....13  
Conservation.....8,25,29  
Education.....16  
Electrification.....26  
Expenditures.....23  
Experts and consultants..5  
Farm mortgage.....2  
Farm program.....4,22,34  
Foreign trade.....17  
Forest Service.....1  
Forestry.....2,9,24  
Homesteads.....28  
Housing.....7,21  
Irrigation.....20  
Lands.....27  
Libraries.....30

Minerals.....27  
National parks.....10  
Organization.....33  
Personnel.....5  
Procurement.....11  
Recreation.....24  
Research.....15,32  
Small business.....11  
Taxes.....19  
Timber sales.....9  
Tomatoes.....14  
Youth corps.....8,29  
Water pollution.....6  
Watersheds.....2  
Weights and measures....31  
Wheat.....32

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed Interior appropriation bill. House passed independent offices appropriation bill. Sen. Hruska criticized farm bill. House subcommittee voted to report bill for USDA centennial celebration. Senate debated housing bill. Both Houses received President's Youth Conservation Corps bill. Sen. Humphrey and Rep. Perkins introduced and discussed this bill. Sen. Talmadge commended and inserted Secretary's article, "Public Relations -- Our No. 1 Job."

### SENATE

1. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 6345. Conferees were appointed. pp. 9040-51

By a vote of 77 to 13, agreed to an amendment by Sen. Dirksen to reduce by \$10 million, from \$149,200,200 to \$139,200,200, the item for forest land management, forest protection and utilization, Forest Service. p. 9042

Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Proxmire to restore \$300,000 disapproved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for detailed design and cost estimates for constructing additional laboratory facilities at the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wisc. p. 9048

2. THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: p. D422

S. 302, to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$2 million for the purchase of land within the boundaries of the Superior National Forest, Minn.

S. 650, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to permit any irrigation or reservoir company, water users' association, or similar organization approved by the Secretary of Agriculture to sponsor works of improvement.

S. 848, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a parcel of forest land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn.



S. 1040, to provide for the abolishment of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

3. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved the following watershed projects: Crowabout Creek and Powell Creek, Ala.; Grady Could, Ark.; Hog-River-Pig-Creek, Ill.; Beasha Creek, Miss.; Panther Creek, Mo.; Haikey Creek, Okla.; Cane Creek, Tenn.; and Blue Creek, Utah. p. D422
4. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "announced that sometime next week it will proceed to consider S. 1643, proposed Agricultural Act of 1961." p. D422  
Sen. Hruska criticized the farm bill, particularly the procedure for establishing farmer advisory committees and stated that the "procedures provided in S. 1643 are not democratic. Nor is the democratic process called into play." pp. 9039-40
5. PERSONNEL. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 884, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants. p. D422
6. WATER POLLUTION. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. 120, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act so as to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control (S.Rept.353). p. 9013
7. HOUSING. Continued debate on S. 1922, the omnibus housing bill. pp. 9051-77
8. CONSERVATION; YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. Both Houses received from the President a proposed bill "to authorize pilot training and employment programs for youth including on-the-job and other appropriate training, local public service programs, and conservation programs," and including the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps; to H. Education and Labor and S. Labor and Public Welfare Committees. pp. 9009, 9012
9. FORESTRY. Sen. Neuberger inserted a joint release by the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior regarding Federal timber sales policies stating that Secretaries Freeman and Udall "announced adoption of a study and recommendations made by the two Departments to bring timber sale practices by the two agencies into closer uniformity," and including a summary of 13 recommendations which were adopted. pp. 9036-7
10. NATIONAL PARKS. Sen. Neuberger inserted an article, "Preserving Our National Parks." pp. 9037-8
11. SMALL BUSINESS; PROCUREMENT. Sen. Smathers submitted for printing a report of the Select Committee on Small Business, "The Role of Small Business in Government Procurement - 1961" (S. Rept. 355). p. 9077

#### HOUSE

12. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with an amendment H. R. 7445, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1962. See Digest 94 for a summary of items of interest to this Dept. pp. 8975-9000
13. CENTENNIALS. Subcommittee No. 2 of the Judiciary Committee voted to report to the full committee H. J. Res. 435, to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and H. J. Res. 436, to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the national system of land-grant universities and colleges. p. D425





United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 107

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1961

No. 95

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Job 22: 21: *Acquaint now thyself with Him, and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee.*

O Thou who art seeking to set our life in a new perspective and reveal its deeper meaning, inspire us with those attributes and principles of character which will enable us to walk together in the way of blessedness without fear or friction.

May we follow in the noble tradition of those who see clearly that love, sympathy, good will, and understanding are the roads to that unity and fellowship among the nations which we are so eagerly and earnestly longing and laboring for.

Grant that our wayward wills may be linked to Thy divine will in a single-hearted devotion and may we possess that acquaintance with Thee which is peace and yield ourselves to Thy mind which is infinitely wiser than our own.

Encourage us to seek Thy guidance and strength, believing that never has man sincerely sought Thy help in the doing of good, without finding and receiving it.

Hear us in the name of the Master who went about doing good. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REPORT ON HIS EUROPEAN TRIP

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon at the bipartisan meeting with the House and Senate leadership and later in a TV broadcast President Kennedy made a report on his recent trip to Paris, to Vienna, and to London.

In both instances he sought to give us an accurate accounting of what transpired, together with his impression of the responsible heads of state with whom he met, and his evaluation of the troublesome spots in the world and the international situation generally.

Our President has assured us that there were no secret agreements, commitments, or understandings of any kind nor was any intended. The trip served the purpose of reemphasizing to the world that this country stands firmly committed to the right of all men to be free and secure in that right. Let there be no misunderstanding in that respect, and let there be no misunderstanding that as a people we are united in carrying out that commitment and, however discouraging, we intend to continue our efforts for the maintenance of the peace of the world.

It is quite evident from President Kennedy's report that this will be a long, hard struggle and that it will necessitate patience and sacrifices. Our enormous defense demands upon our economy will continue in the foreseeable future and may become even larger.

First things first. To meet our security requirements we must forego luxuries. Most respectfully, I urge the President and the Congress to forego the political luxury that may be enjoyed by these various new spending programs that have been recommended along with recommended expansion of costly programs already in existence.

While we seek to make ourselves strong internationally, we must deter-

mine to be strong nationally. We can destroy ourselves with debts, taxes, and inflation just as surely as we can be destroyed by communism if we let down our military guard in cooperation with our allies in defense of freedom.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

|              |               |                |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adair        | Gray          | O'Konski       |
| Bailey       | Green, Oreg.  | O'Neill        |
| Barry        | Hagan, Ga.    | Philbin        |
| Bates        | Halpern       | Pilcher        |
| Beermann     | Harris        | Powell         |
| Betts        | Harrison, Va. | Rains          |
| Blitch       | Hébert        | Rivers, Alaska |
| Boggs        | Holifield     | Rivers, S.C.   |
| Boykin       | Hosmer        | Roberts        |
| Celler       | Kearns        | Santangelo     |
| Coad         | Kilburn       | Shelley        |
| Daniels      | Kilday        | Sikes          |
| Davis, Tenn. | King, Utah    | Spence         |
| Dominick     | Kirwan        | Thompson, N.J. |
| Fallon       | Knox          | Tupper         |
| Fino         | Lankford      | Utt            |
| Flood        | Macdonald     | Vinson         |
| Flynt        | Mason         | Walter         |
| Fogarty      | Miller        | Westland       |
| Gavin        | George P.     | Williams       |
| Granahan     | Miller, N.Y.  | Willis         |
| Grant        | O'Brien, N.Y. |                |

The SPEAKER. On this rolloall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the



State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York, Mr. OSTERTAG, and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7445, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we come to you, our colleagues, this morning with this independent agencies bill that covers some 23 agencies. I think I can say with accuracy that your subcommittee has brought to you a bill that is about unanimous with all of us. It covers a good many details, as you know. You are certainly entitled to every bit of information that you need and want, and it will be our sincere effort to give you all the information that we have. So I suggest to the membership that all the members of the subcommittee are here, and we will severally or jointly try to give you all the information we have, because nothing should be withheld and you are entitled to know at least all we know, and we will gladly give it to you.

In the first place, there are about 23 agencies covered in this bill. The budget estimate in round figures is \$8.6 billion. The committee reduced the amount about \$201 million. If there is anything wrong with the bill, I might say it is a little bit on the generous side, but I think there is much to be said on that point, too.

In the first place, of that \$8.6 billion \$4.9 billion is for the Veterans' Administration. As far as cuts are concerned, in dollars and cents there is virtually no cut in here. In the medical program of \$1,011 million not one penny was reduced. I repeat, of the entire medical program costing in excess of \$1 billion, not one penny was reduced. On the contrary, we went \$5 million over the budget in that regard with respect to medical research.

Of course, there are some other sizable agencies in here, such as the Federal Aviation Agency and the Space Agency. The General Services Administration is a big operation. The housing program is a big operation. But by and large, most of the increase goes to about three agencies in this bill.

Much has been said about the independent agencies. We have all heard the criticism that they have accumulated a tremendous backlog in their workload. But, I want to say a kind word about these independent regulatory agencies, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission and so on. We think they are doing a pretty good job. But, again, the newspapers have leveled criticism at them and it is generally said the reason the backlog is so great is that they do not have the manpower. What does that add up to? It adds up to one thing. It is inferentially suggesting that the Congress has not given them enough money to hire the necessary manpower. We do not agree with them at all. But, I want to point out to you every one of those agencies has asked for a sizable increase in manpower and the committee has been, in our judgment, very lenient with them. I believe, if you will read the report, you will come to that same conclusion also.

But let us go back to that backlog that they complain about. Here is the truth of the matter of the backlog. These independent regulatory agencies cannot control at least two-thirds of their backlog. If you were to give them an army of men, they would have no control over at least two-thirds of it. Well, then, who does control it, if the agencies themselves do not? The controlling factor is the parties litigants. They control it. They appeal decisions. They file motions. Of course, that is perfectly legal. They have the legal right to do that. But, that is what delays matters and that is what accumulates the big backlog. Those agencies will tell you if a case is put on their desk, they will get rid of it in no time. But, it is not put on their desk for decision—motions are filed to continue; appeals are filed—and again, I repeat, it is perfectly legal—the law gives them that right. That is what creates the backlog, and they have no control over at least 60 to 65 percent of it. But most of them, we think, are doing a good job. Of course, they are human like everybody else and make some mistakes. But by and large, they are doing all right.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something about the space agency. They came in for about \$1,235 million. May I point out very definitely in the beginning that the authorization had not been completed in its entirety. It had already passed the House but had not cleared the other body. But, we acted and there is also a revised estimate for \$549 million additional which has just been submitted and will be considered soon. But I want to say this. They have these big laboratories scattered all over the country. Three of them were inherited, of course, from the old predecessor agency, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, but in my humble judgment, they are staffed with very fine, capable gentlemen. Take Mr. Webb who is head of the organization. Personally, I have known him for a long time and most of you have known him

for a long time. He has been before your committees a number of times. At one time he was Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He was one of the Under Secretaries of the Department of State, and in recent years he has been in business and has been in the scientific business. He is not a scientist, but he is on favorable terms with the scientists. He has been associated with them in scientific projects and, in my humble judgment, he is going to make a great Administrator. Look at Dr. Dryden—one of the finest scientists I know of and one of the best scientist administrators I have ever seen.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that some of the topflight staffmen that Dr. Dryden and Mr. Webb have surrounded themselves with, certainly, gentlemen like Dr. von Braun and Dr. Silverstein, and so forth and so on, are the finest and ablest scientists. They are level headed. I do not know what the ultimate value of the program will be, and if I were to tell you, I know you would think less of me because I do not think any living man knows. But, it certainly has possibilities for good.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], a member of the legislative committee.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. I believe he has accurately stated the present situation as to the organization of NASA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I was formerly a member of the House original Select Committee on Space.

I am a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. We of the committee across party lines are desirous of seeing these U.S. science, research, and space programs go ahead, not only where they are for the security of the country but also for the very good purposes of keeping America first in science and research. The entire research and development item for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration provided for in this bill is \$27,539,000 less than the budget request. I have not been able to go into the details of the cut by the committee since they are not provided by the committee, but I take it from the testimony the gentleman is sure the cut will not delay the programs.

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to have the gentleman's observations. He is an able and distinguished member, not only of this House but also of the Space Committee. He has worked long and hard in this field. I doubt if there are many people in the country who know more about the program than he. I assure the gentleman we have not the slightest intention of throwing it down in any way. We just thought we could save a few dollars, but we are not going to measure savings against their success.

Mr. FULTON. Then I join in the recommendation of the gentleman from Texas at this time. The gentleman from Texas has stated to me that our Science and Astronautics Committee can come back later if we find there is need for



more money to carry out the NASA programs outlined.

Mr. THOMAS. I welcome the gentleman's views and appreciate the support of his committee. I do not think there is going to be too much conflict.

Mr. FULTON. One more point on the construction of facilities: There is \$20 million in this bill for construction of emergency facilities, so it is my feeling that the cut that has been made of \$2,825,000 on construction and facilities will not hold the agency back in necessary programs and I would not oppose that at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that there is in this bill an increase in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration program of \$236 million?

Mr. THOMAS. Over last year.

Mr. GROSS. Over last year; and do I understand further that there is somewhere pending a bill or plan to provide this agency with another \$594 million?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my friend from Iowa that there will be a deficiency bill in the next 2 or 3 weeks. The supplemental estimate is \$549 million more.

Mr. GROSS. So you would not say that this agency was on the verge of poverty.

Mr. THOMAS. They are not poverty stricken as far as that is concerned.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices has continued to be fair in its approach to the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and to the National Science Foundation in the start of an entirely new program in which we have had no previous experience; and I want to put that on the record here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 14 minutes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleagues and associates on the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee. I want to pay particular tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, for his able guidance and leadership, his fairness and devotion to duty, his fund of knowledge and the fine job he has done in developing the hearings in connection with the many independent agencies of our Federal Government.

Along with our chairman, we have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. On our side, along with me, I serve with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. I think it can be said in fairness that both the majority and minority members of this committee have worked together as a team and in close harmony. There has been no political considerations involved. We have tried to do the best

possible job in the consideration of this far-reaching appropriation and the tremendous and varied services applicable throughout the Government as covered by this bill.

First of all, let me point out to you that it took some 2,570 pages of testimony to cover these hearings. We had many weeks of hearings on these budget justifications. You might be interested to know that in this bill some 23 important agencies receive their funds for support of their agencies for the next fiscal year.

As our distinguished chairman has pointed out, this bill totals in round figures \$8,424 million, while the budget requests totaled approximately \$8,625 million. In other words, the committee has found it possible to make a reduction of approximately \$201 million. I grant you that \$201 million is not a large sum in comparison to the overall figure involved in this bill, but it is worthy of note that of this entire bill covering 23 agencies and \$8,424 million, 3 of these agencies absorb seven-eighths of the total.

Of course, we are all aware of the importance and far-reaching effect of the services and the responsibilities that apply in the field of veterans' affairs. In other words, the Veterans' Administration and all of its related operations and services including that of veterans' benefits and care, totals nearly \$5 billion of the \$8,424 million in this bill.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration previously referred to has a budget estimate of approximately \$1,235 million. That, coupled with the Federal Aviation Agency which requires nearly \$725 million, would perhaps amount to better than \$7 billion of the total of \$8.5 billion in this bill.

The space agency which has been mentioned previously presented its budget request on the basis of the previous administration's estimated requirements and, as has been mentioned, it is very likely that the administration will come in with a supplemental budget request totaling about \$549 million in addition to \$1,200 billion as provided in this bill. This will be justified in a deficiency bill and I believe this request will be associated with an accelerated space program as described by the President in his recent message to Congress.

It is fair to note that not only in this bill but in many bills, in fact, in practically all appropriation bills coming before the Congress, these justifications are presented by a new administration but they are based on budgets prepared by the previous administration. It is only fair to say that many of the new commissioners, administrators, and new heads of these agencies, have not had an opportunity to become familiar with the many important matters that constitute the funding for their agencies.

For example, we have in this bill funds for civil defense mobilization. In this same message of the President, he presented an accelerated program in the field of defense, in the field of space exploration, and specific recommendations which relates to the management of the system and the controls of our civil defense program and functions. If the President's recommendations are

carried out and accepted by the Congress, we can assume that the funds that are essential for this program will of necessity require transfer authority to another agency, namely, the Defense Department. Just how this will fall into place I am not prepared to say, but certainly all the committee could do at this time was to appropriate the funds necessary to carry out the program and services under the existing law and machinery.

I might point out to you that in the field of civil defense we are appropriating approximately \$79 million for fiscal year 1962. Some of that money has to do with disaster relief and emergencies. It also provides moneys not only for this Federal agency, but it provides for the Federal contributions to the localities for such items, equipment and for training, and under the new program, for personnel as provided by law. Such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission are involved in this bill. National Capital Housing Authority. I should like to take just a moment to give you a bit of a picture of the veterans' program as it was presented to your committee.

Recognizing as we must the far-reaching and tremendous operations of our Veterans' Administration covered by this budget of \$4,924 million. Actually a reduction of \$45 million has been made. But, I think it is worthy to note that we did not cut the veterans program and we do not propose to cut the veterans program, and the \$45 million difference is primarily brought about by virtue of the needs for pensions and compensation. Whatever is required to meet this obligation must be provided. The anticipated unobligated balance of \$215 million in this item will be carried forward into this fiscal year. In other words, the Veterans' Administration will have a balance of \$215 million which was not anticipated in the first place. So, it is reasonable to assume that not only will the VA have a balance going into this year but it is expected they will have a balance at the end of the next fiscal year. The general operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration takes about \$161 million, and that is a slight decrease due to the decline in the workload of the vocational rehabilitation and education program. In the field of compensation and pensions, I am wondering if the Members of the House realize that out of this total sum of nearly \$5 billion for the VA \$3.5 billion of it goes to veterans of America in the form of compensation and pensions. As I mentioned before, a \$215 million carryover exists. We have today in the United States of America approximately 22,425,000 veterans. So, for pensions and compensation that \$3.5 billion is paid to approximately 3,077,000 veterans.

Medical care. With our tremendous hospital system I think it is fair to say that the veterans hospitals of America constitute the largest and best hospital system in the world. We are appropriating here in this bill \$1,012 million for medical care for our veterans. There is no cut. Actually, we have in operation today 139,372 beds in our veterans hospitals, and that is an increase of nearly 1,000 beds in our veterans hos-



pitals throughout the country. There is an increase of \$30 million due to this patient load, and the total cost of our inpatient care is \$846 million. The outpatient care, which is the care given to veterans in their homes or in the doctor's office or in the clinics throughout the country amounts to the difference between the \$1.012 billion figure and the \$846 million. But, it is important, too, to recognize that the committee has been not only concerned but liberal in the granting of funds for our veterans. For example, the budget request called for \$22 million for medical research. Do you know that we have included in this bill \$27 million for medical research? And, I want to pay tribute to the job that has been done in the field of medical research throughout our veterans facilities, institutions, and hospitals. The estimate is that they do need the \$27 million and the committee not only granted the requested amount, but increased the amount by \$5 million for next year.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I want to state that I agree entirely with the gentleman's appreciation for the VA research program. Our subcommittee is very proud of the progress that has been made with our help in this program. I think in this appropriation of \$27 million for additional facilities, as is shown on page 527 of the hearings, there is provision not only for a specific program of projects but an allocation as well for construction of laboratories. Such laboratories are an essential part of a good research program, and they are needed for the V.A. medical program.

For those members who are interested in knowing about the accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration, there is an itemized statement of the great achievements that have been performed under this program. These appear in the hearings starting on page 465 in response to the question of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York is to be commended for his warm support of this program.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. My distinguished friend and colleague remarked a few minutes ago, I believe, that there was not a reduction in the funds provided for veterans' hospital construction. If I read the record right, it indicates that there was a reduction of \$5 million from the budget estimate. I have a communication this morning, as most of the Members perhaps have, addressing itself to the restoration of this so-called \$5 million cut. Would it be the gentleman's position that there are holdover funds or other moneys available so that there will not be a reduction in the money available for construction?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I was about to refer to the hospital construction program,

which is a part of this overall veterans' picture, and to try to give you a concise and in-a-nutshell picture. We must bear in mind that we are in the second year of a 12-year construction, modernization, and replacement program for our veterans' facilities. The total cost of this program is approximately \$900 million, in broad figures. Last year we appropriated the requested sum. This year there was a budget request of \$75 million. The committee has made available approximately \$70 million of that \$75 million to carry on this construction and modernization program. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the last thing in the world this committee would attempt to do would be to retard, or hinder this program in any way, by not making available all the funds necessary to carry it out.

The point is that within this program approximately \$850,000 was included for fallout shelters. The committee has eliminated the requested amount for fallout shelters not only in the veterans' hospital program but in all public buildings programs throughout this bill.

Second, it must be pointed out that the balance of the \$5 million that has been reduced in connection with the overall construction is brought about by virtue of the fact that \$49 million is carried over from the current fiscal year. It is anticipated that at the end of this 1962 fiscal year they will still have approximately \$42 million in unexpended funds for this purpose. So in the face of the balance or the carryover into this year and the anticipated balance at the end of this next year you cannot regard this amount of \$5 million as a cut or a reduction. If it is needed and can be used, I am sure every one of us would support it.

Mr. ROBISON. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. In explanation, may I say that I know he shares my own interest in the veterans' activities. I am sure he would not support anything in the committee action here which would in any way delay the proper reconstruction or replacement of facilities that are badly needed.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This appropriation includes funds for technical services for hospital replacement at Atlanta, Ga., and Los Angeles, Calif. It includes construction funds for 16 modernizations, technical services for 4 others, and many minor improvements at other locations. So I repeat that I for one, and I feel that every member of the committee would not be a party to any move which would destroy, hamper, or impede this modernization or construction program. We want them to have all that is required.

The National Science Foundation is another agency, included in this bill. It has grown in importance and expanded in its application and effect. Actually, it has an increase of \$74 million. We have several other agencies, but time will not permit me to go into a discussion of them despite the fact that their operations are important insofar as the overall operation of the Government is concerned. I refer to such agencies as the Federal Aviation Agency, the Fed-

eral Power Commission, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and last but not least the important General Services Administration, which is the housekeeping agency of our National Government and one which has a tremendous responsibility of far-reaching importance insofar as the general operations are concerned, including supervision of our public buildings.

Perhaps, as time goes on, we will have an opportunity to discuss the details of these services and programs, but you can readily see that this bill embraces many agencies, many functions, and many services. We, as a committee, have tried to do a good job in the best interests not only of the services of the Government but in the interest of good government and efficiency.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, there have been some remarks in this debate on the independent offices appropriations bill about the shocking backlogs which exist in some of the regulatory agencies. Attempts have been made to justify or explain away these grievous delays by attributing them to the filing of motions or appeals by litigants. I cannot accept such a lame excuse.

In many States of our Nation, including my own State of New Jersey, rules of courts have been so amended as to speed the administration of justice. This has been done by enforcing time limits for making and perfecting motions and appeals so that undue delay could be eliminated.

It is just as true in regulatory agencies as in courts that justice delayed is justice denied. The people of America have the right to demand that the protection given to them be not dissipated by stalling tactics employed by firms and persons called to account before independent regulatory agencies. These agencies must see to it that their rules insure prompt disposition of pending matters so that the public will be protected.

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to serve on this subcommittee. The members on both sides are able, genial, considerate and friendly, and their keen interest in the proceedings and their intelligent questions made the long hearings a very happy experience. For this I am most grateful to them.

To try to discuss this bill within the time allotted for the debate is obviously impossible. The bill contains appropriations for 23 agencies with a budget of approximately \$8½ billion. The activities of each of any one of the agencies involved and their monetary needs could very well take weeks and in some instances months, the programs are so intricate and complicated. As a matter



of fact, we did spend months in our hearings and I invite your attention to them. I think we did a pretty good job and I commend passage of the bill to the House.

I want only to comment on several points today. One relates to the National Science Foundation, an agency which is doing an outstanding job in advancing the cause of science in our country. Most of its emphasis is in the field of physical sciences and I suppose this is as it should be in a time when the pressure for scientific advancement to protect our national interests and promote national defense is so essential. And yet, I cannot escape the belief that the vast amount appropriated for this agency—and for that matter, for all the agencies of our Government—is disproportionately small for the social sciences. It has been said that we have never lost a war and have never won the peace. Perhaps this is in some measure attributable to the lack of emphasis given the studies of the relationships of men with each other and communities with each other. The advancement of the cause of peace must be our constant engagement.

On page 400 of the hearings, I raised the question with the great men of science who appeared before our committee as witnesses. I raised the question and I said:

Where do you draw the line with respect to basic research in the field of social sciences or do you seek to draw a line?

I am not one to draw that line because I think it is just as vital that we find a way for people to live together in a social entity as it is to make people's lives more bearable through scientific progress.

Are you doing anything to advance the cause of social sciences? Is it not of extreme importance to study the basis of establishing peaceful relationships between people and nations? Is that part of your function, to help the universities turn out people trained to think in these fields? What is your role in this respect?

The physical sciences make our contribution toward this goal, but how very important, too, in this cause are the social sciences.

I suggest this is a most proper function for the National Science Foundation. In reply to my question, Dr. Bronk, who is one of America's great scientific minds, stated at page 401 of the hearings:

Dr. BRONK. Behavioral science, psychology, and the understanding of the human mind and the behavior of people are extremely important. In order to help the burgeoning, so-called behavioral sciences, we have projects we are supporting in that area.

I commend the National Science Foundation for its growing interest in the field of the social sciences. I wish it would do more in this field and I wish, too, that it were possible to elasticize its understanding as to what constitutes basic research in the social sciences. I must say that I found some of its approved projects in this field quite abstruse and remote, possibly too remote. I hope it will be possible for them to recognize the advantages and benefits to mankind which may ensue from creative research in the field of human relationships. In this way the National

Science Foundation, too, may strike a powerful blow in the cause of peace.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. We have the National Science Foundation in the independent offices appropriation bill and we have the National Defense Education Act providing fellowships and so on and so forth under the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. How many committees are handling funds of this nature?

Mr. YATES. Funds for the educational process?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. YATES. I would think all of them would be so engaged. I think the total amount the Government pays for research and fellowships exceeds \$2 billion, which is split up among the various appropriation subcommittees and almost all of the agencies of Government. I think, if the gentleman reads the hearings, as I know he does, having observed his actions with reference to previous appropriations bills and on this appropriations bill, he will find that almost all of the 23 agencies in this bill, for example, have programs of research. I think that is good. I think research programs are essential to the well-being of our people and of our country. I might say to the gentleman, anticipating I hope, what I think his question is going to be, that it is one of the functions of the National Science Foundation to act as a clearinghouse for scientific research programs. This is one of the responsibilities that was given to it by its organizing legislation. It has tried to act as a clearinghouse with some success, not as much as I will like, but it has tried. It has not yet achieved that very estimable goal. I hope they do it soon. I have tried to press them into doing it, and year by year when I have questioned them on this point, they have advised our subcommittee they are making progress in preventing unnecessary duplication in research.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what I am trying to get at. I am not critical of the program necessarily, but can we not get this all under one tent so that we will know what we are doing?

Mr. YATES. I think it would be desirable if we could get it under one tent, to use the gentleman's phrase. Certainly, there should be a central agency which has the task of gathering information about all Government research projects. However, each of the Government agencies is a specialist in its own field. Therefore, it takes jurisdiction of research in its field.

I am sure the gentleman will agree with me, that it is essential that the National Science Foundation be pressed to work increasingly harder to become such a clearinghouse.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I find increasingly difficult to comprehend. How do we keep up with this thing when untold millions of dollars are authorized and appropriated by many committees and for the same or related purposes? We find it is scattered all over, even in the farm appropriation bill.

Mr. YATES. There is research provided for in the farm appropriations bill, and I think there should be. We want continuous improved quality and quantity in food production. I am strong for research programs. They help us keep abreast of the world, and I wonder whether the gentleman's complaint is not really the same as the poet, Wordsworth, when he said:

The world is too much with us late and soon.

We hope through research activities to keep abreast of developments in this fast-changing world.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I wish to support the gentleman's position in the matter of research and development. The Bureau of the Budget has come up with the figure of \$5 billion for other civilian agencies, including national defense. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think the gentleman from Illinois will agree with me apropos the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee that the committee has been concerned about this very matter of correlating these activities.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. And we are trying to the best of our ability to bring some order into this thing. I personally think that there should be an office, or person, or committee in Government that would bring together a record for the research programs that the Government is sponsoring.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. We always ask the National Science Foundation about its clearinghouse activities.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I want to join in what my colleague from North Carolina has said, that there should be this clearinghouse to correlate information regarding research activities. We are all concerned with the money that is being spent by every agency of government in fields which overlap and where there is duplication, but this is an agency which has developed over the years. Need for research activity in many fields is very great, but we should find some means by which we can bring some semblance of order into this program.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to our colleague that the National Science Foundation Act makes it clear that one of the functions of the National Science Foundation is to coordinate throughout the Government all



scientific activities. If there is any weakness in that act that weakness lies in the fact that there is no power of enforcement, the National Science Foundation has no power to force its ideas on other governmental agencies. We go into those activities every year, and it is justified by the National Science Foundation, and its very distinguished 25 members from all the big universities in the country and some of the finest research institutions. I think they oversee, coordinate, and work hand in glove with other agencies of the Government which participate in the spending of perhaps some \$8 billion a year on scientific investigation and research.

Mr. YATES. And the gentleman from Texas does a fine job in requiring National Science Foundation to do its work.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I just wanted to stand up and congratulate the gentleman for evidencing a knowledge of poetry. I think we are long wasting our powers by spending. I think we are giving the Treasury away as a sort of boon. I think the gentleman knows what I am referring to.

Mr. YATES. I do, but I cannot agree with the gentleman that our country is laying waste its powers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the House ought to know that our expenditures at this time for research will run well in excess of \$10 billion a year. That is a lot more than we have been talking about here. There would be pretty close to \$5 billion in the armed services alone, there must be close to \$500 million in the Public Health Service. There is an enormous amount in this bill here. I think we ought to realize that so that the people who are saying we are not putting money enough will have the answer.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

I was unaware of the amount of money for research in the Armed Forces bill. Frequently in the House we tend, Mr. Chairman, to engage too easily in superlatives and superficial compliments. Occasionally, they come from the heart. I want to say with all the sincerity I possess, Mr. Chairman, how proud I am to be a part of the subcommittee headed by Chairman THOMAS, of Texas. I know many of the Members of the House and many are among the most able I have met. None, however, has greater ability than the genial gentleman from Texas. He is in a class by himself. Each year of the many years I have served with him, I have been amazed at the grasp he has of the activities of the agencies that come before us, of their budgets, of their successes, of their subterfuges. My admiration, my respect, my esteem for him mounts each year. We do not disagree very often, and when we do we disagree on minor things. It is about one of these, a remark he made today

about the regulatory commissions that I want to speak.

I do not believe the regulatory commissions have been doing well. As was shown by the study made by Dean Landis of the Harvard Law School last December, the Commissions are not assuming their responsibilities in accordance with the mandate given to them by the Congress. Our hearings disclose that backlog rests upon backlog in each of the Commissions, often without good reason. Who is hurt by this? The only ones who are hurt are the people, the people who are the taxpayers and the ratepayers. They are the ones who are losing the protection that Congress intended they should receive when these Commissions were created. The Commissions have in too great a measure become attuned to the needs and voice of industry rather than the public. Perhaps it is unfair to generalize and say all Commissions have been derelict, because all of the Commissions have not; but the fact remains that the enormous growth of our economic structure has placed tremendous burdens on regulatory agencies, and some have failed more than others. Most of the agencies are falling behind in their work. They are unable to keep pace with the growth of our economy.

We have attempted to make available adequate appropriations for the agencies each year. There are adequate appropriations in this budget for these agencies. As a matter of fact, some of the agencies have escaped the traditional ax of the Appropriations Committee. We have given them all that they requested, and we hope and we admonish the agencies to more aggressively assume their responsibilities in the public interest.

There is one agency I think deserves particular censure for its failure to assume its responsibility to the public. I refer to the Federal Power Commission, this Commission has been a slacker. It has little conception of the public interest particularly in the field of natural gas regulation. I quote from page 54 of the report of Dean Landis to the President of last December:

The Federal Power Commission without question represents the outstanding example in the Federal Government of the breakdown of the administrative process. The complexity of its problems is no answer to its more than patent failures. These failures relate primarily to the natural gas field, in the Commission's handling of its responsibilities with respect to the transmission and the production of natural gas. Enough has already been said about the delays in this field, so terribly costly to the public and so productive of unemployment in other basic industries.

These defects stem from attitudes, plainly evident on the record, of the unwillingness of the Commission to assume its responsibilities under the Natural Gas Act and its attitude, substantially contemptuous, of refusing in substance to obey the mandates of the Supreme Court of the United States and other Federal courts.

Mr. Chairman, the indictment continues, but I will not read it all. I know when I interrogated the Commissioners of the Federal Power Commission. I asked what they were doing to regulate

the natural gas industry. I was told they are undertaking hearings shortly to determine the manner of regulating the rates of the natural gas producers. The Phillips decision was issued in 1954. Since that time the Commission has moved one way, then another, has hemmed and hawed and zigged and zagged, but has come to no specific decision on rate regulation for the natural gas industry. It is shocking and shameful.

As a matter of fact, the statement of the chairman of the Federal Power Commission before our committee was to the effect that no matter how much money was given to the Federal Power Commission to carry out its responsibility in the natural gas field, the Commission could not regulate the industry. I said:

You don't mean to tell this committee that if we gave you as much money as you requested you could not regulate the industry?

And, the answer was:

Substantially, yes.

That they just could not obtain the people to do the work; the work was so tremendous that it could not be done.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I would like to compliment the gentleman as a member of the committee, as well as the committee itself in their effort to get more equitable and speedy action from these regulatory agencies. Without particular regard to the agency about which he has been speaking, I could cite, if time permitted, a number of other agencies whose chief stock in trade seems to be a willingness to procrastinate and delay and do nothing. In many cases this results in a financial loss to the public at large because of their dilatory tactics. And, I would say quite frankly that I do not believe in most instances there was a lack of proper budget consideration that brought about this situation.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I would agree with him in respect to the criticism he makes of the agencies. I think, however, that the practitioners before the agencies may bear a portion of the responsibility for the delay in disposing of the cases, but after all the responsibility for disposing of its work is the Commission's. I am firm in my conviction that an aggressive commission can do much to eliminate the backlog and have a speedy disposition of the cases pending before them.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McFALL. I wish to commend the committee for one particular action in reference to the Federal Communications Commission by the adding of some 20 employees to the Safety and Special Radio Services Group. They have been doing an excellent job under a great handicap. They need these 20 people to clear up the big backlog of work.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentlemen for his statement.



Mr. Chairman, I want to close by commending one of the watchdogs of the Treasury, the guardian of the Government's utilities bill. I refer to the Transportation and Public Utilities Section of the General Services Administration. This is the one agency in the Federal Government which tries to make sure that the Federal Government is not overcharged on its more than \$1 billion utility bill. It has done a good job. Its activities have resulted in savings to the Federal Government, and I believe that their work in the future will continue to deserve the commendation of our committee and of the Congress.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration today appropriates \$8,424,098,000 and provides funds for 23 independent executive agencies for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961. This is a staggering sum and underscores the responsibility owed to the taxpayers of this country by those of us who have been selected as custodians of their tax dollars. It is the obligation of all of us to see that the agencies involved are sufficiently financed to properly execute

their functions but equally important, it is our obligation to see that tax dollars are not squandered on overstaffing, duplication, waste or inefficiency.

It should be borne in mind that, large as this appropriation is, it covers the financing of only 23 of the independent offices of the Government and does not include any of the activities that are under the supervision of a cabinet officer. A mere listing of these offices and agencies and the amounts included in the bill before the committee today will present striking evidence of the ever-growing complex of the Federal Government. I will include such list at this point in my remarks, as follows:

| Agency                                   | Budget estimates, 1962    | Recommended in bill       | Bill compared with budget estimates | Agency  | Budget estimates, 1962 | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with budget estimates |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| National Aeronautics and Space Council   | \$320,000                 | \$320,000                 | -----                               | Interstate Commerce Commission                | \$22,200,000           | \$21,950,000        | -\$250,000                          |
| Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization | 104,200,000               | 79,167,000                | -\$25,033,000                       | National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 1,235,300,000          | 1,200,000,000       | -\$35,300,000                       |
| Disaster relief                          | 6,000,000                 | 6,000,000                 | -----                               | National Capital Housing Authority            | 40,000                 | 40,000              | -----                               |
| Civil Aeronautics Board                  | 90,750,000                | 83,700,000                | -\$7,050,000                        | National Science Foundation                   | 277,000,000            | 250,000,000         | -\$27,000,000                       |
| Civil Service Commission                 | 95,502,000                | 91,844,000                | -\$3,658,000                        | Renegotiation Board                           | 3,000,000              | 2,900,000           | -\$100,000                          |
| Federal Aviation Agency                  | 744,300,000               | 723,500,000               | -\$20,800,000                       | Securities and Exchange Commission            | 11,015,000             | 11,000,000          | -\$15,000                           |
| Federal Communications Commission        | 12,525,000                | 12,400,000                | -\$125,000                          | Selective Service System                      | 34,475,000             | 33,670,000          | -\$805,000                          |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board             | <sup>1</sup> (12,981,000) | <sup>1</sup> (12,981,000) | -----                               | Veterans' Administration                      | 4,924,846,000          | 4,809,571,000       | -\$45,275,000                       |
| Federal Power Commission                 | 8,793,000                 | 8,793,000                 | -----                               | Total   | 8,625,561,000          | 8,424,098,000       | -\$201,463,000                      |
| Federal Trade Commission                 | 10,690,000                | 10,000,000                | -\$690,000                          |   |                        |                     |                                     |
| General Accounting Office                | 43,000,000                | 43,000,000                | -----                               |   |                        |                     |                                     |
| General Services Administration          | 552,170,000               | 535,390,000               | -\$16,780,000                       |   |                        |                     |                                     |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency          | 262,050,000               | 247,950,000               | -\$14,100,000                       |   |                        |                     |                                     |
| Federal National Mortgage Association    | <sup>1</sup> (7,450,000)  | <sup>1</sup> (7,400,000)  | (\$50,000)                          |   |                        |                     |                                     |
| Federal Housing Administration           | <sup>1</sup> (71,975,000) | <sup>1</sup> (67,600,000) | (\$4,375,000)                       |   |                        |                     |                                     |
| Public Housing Administration            | 183,450,000               | 178,968,000               | -\$4,482,000                        |   |                        |                     |                                     |

<sup>1</sup> Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses.

I should say here and now that the formulation of such a bill is not an easy task. The subcommittee heard testimony from hundreds of witnesses and their testimony and cross examination fills two large volumes of more than 2,500 pages. This bill is the product of hours of study, consideration and compromise. I say compromise because on a measure of such scope and size seven individuals serving as a subcommittee cannot be expected to agree on every point. But we have done our best to find common ground upon which to adjust our conflicting viewpoints and the bill before

you represents the composite judgment of the subcommittee. It was arrived at as a result of a blending of our collective knowledge of what we have learned from past experience, liberally spiced with some guesswork, some old fashioned horse sense and some hunch. The bill met the approval of the full Committee on Appropriations.

The printed report provides a detailed explanation of the actions taken by the subcommittee. It shows the budget estimate in each case and the action taken by the committee. It compares amounts

appropriated in the bill with agency requests and with funds appropriated last year for each individual agency. The bill appropriates \$69,945,400 less than last year and \$201,463,000 less than this year's requests.

In reviewing the budget estimates and appropriations agency by agency, it should be noted that almost without exception these civilian agencies sought substantial increases in employees. I include at this point a table showing increased requests and the committee action in each case.

|  | Positions |             |                   |       |   | Positions |             |                   |        |
|--|-----------|-------------|-------------------|-------|---|-----------|-------------|-------------------|--------|
|  | 1961      | 1962 budget | Proposed increase | Bill  |   | 1961      | 1962 budget | Proposed increase | Bill   |
| National Aeronautics and Space Council | -----     | 18          | 18                | 18    | Interstate Commerce Commission                | 2,428     | 2,494       | 66                | 44     |
| Civil Aeronautics Board                | 800       | 881         | 81                | 70    | National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 16,493    | 18,122      | 1,629             | 1,500  |
| Civil Service Commission               | 2,558     | 2,651       | 93                | 24    | National Science Foundation                   | 628       | 742         | 114               | 85     |
| Federal Aviation Agency                | 42,431    | 45,060      | 2,629             | 1,487 | Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization      | 1,650     | 1,650       | -----             | 50     |
| Federal Communications Commission      | 1,483     | 1,539       | 56                | 50    | Renegotiation Board                           | 287       | 286         | -1                | -10    |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board           | 1,128     | 1,226       | 98                | 98    | Securities and Exchange Commission            | 1,090     | 1,254       | 164               | 163    |
| Federal Power Commission               | 898       | 980         | 82                | 82    | Selective Service System                      | 5,197     | 5,197       | -----             | -----  |
| Federal Trade Commission               | 823       | 1,119       | 296               | 230   | Veterans' Administration                      | 157,340   | 159,742     | 2,402             | 2,200  |
| General Accounting Office              | 5,172     | 5,122       | -50               | -50   | Total   | 282,161   | 292,265     | +10,104           | +6,899 |
| General Services Administration        | 30,502    | 31,700      | 1,198             | 158   |   |           |             |                   |        |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency:       |           |             |                   |       |   |           |             |                   |        |
| Office of the Administrator            | 1,886     | 2,264       | 378               | 265   |   |           |             |                   |        |
| Federal Housing Administration         | 7,008     | 7,799       | 791               | 500   |   |           |             |                   |        |
| Public Housing Administration          | 1,405     | 1,425       | 20                | ----- |   |           |             |                   |        |
| Federal National Mortgage Association  | 954       | 994         | 40                | 35    |   |           |             |                   |        |



It should also be noted, and I wish to emphasize, that there are 5,172 positions in the General Accounting Office. In his budget estimate presented to the committee, the Comptroller General recommended that this total be reduced by 50 in fiscal year 1962. Although GAO workload is increasing as fast as that of other civilian agencies, it volunteered to take a reduction of 50 positions. This agency deserves commendation for a fine job performed in looking after the taxpayers' dollars.

#### MOTOR POOL OPERATION

Public Law 152 of the 83d Congress authorized the General Services Administration to establish and operate interagency motor vehicle pools. I was the author of this legislation and have understandably been particularly interested in the progress of the program. In its budget presentation to our subcommittee, General Services Administration each year makes a detailed report on the operation of these motor vehicle pools and when the bill is under consideration in the Committee of the Whole I usually make a progress report for the information of the Members of the House.

Approximately 18,900 vehicles are currently being operated by 59 interagency motor pools. This is an increase of three pools and 1,560 vehicles during the first 9 months of this fiscal year. Motor pool vehicles traveled over 159 million miles in this period which was an increase of 34 percent over last year. By the end of the present fiscal year General Services Administration expects to have 65 interagency motor pools operating 19,300 vehicles.

To give some idea of the vastness of Government ownership and operation of motor vehicles, I should tell you that there are some 220,000 automobiles not

in the pool. Most of these vehicles are utilized in operations scattered throughout the country in such a manner that pool operation is impractical. In order for a motor pool operation to be efficient it must be in a congested area where the maximum mileage can be obtained out of each vehicle. By establishing interagency pools in areas where there is a heavy concentration of government activity, such as in New York, Washington, Chicago, Cleveland, and so forth, substantial savings have resulted. Interagency motor pool operation reduces the number of vehicles required, increases the utilization of each vehicle permitting three cars to accomplish the work formerly done by four, consolidates management and provides for effective and efficient maintenance.

General Services Administration officials testifying before the subcommittee presented evidence showing that at the end of 1960 there were 56 interagency motor pools established. As of that time, the operation of these pools had resulted in a reduction of more than 20 percent in the number of vehicles previously required to accomplish a similar workload. This has amounted to a saving of nearly 4,000 vehicles required to do the work now performed by pool vehicles.

During the last fiscal year total savings from motor pool operations amounted to over \$5 million and by the end of fiscal year 1962, the annual savings will be over \$7 million.

The testimony further revealed that accumulated savings from the beginning of the program through June 30, 1960 are \$15,697,506.

It is estimated that total accumulated savings through June 30, 1961 will be \$22,514,967.

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

In studying the report of this bill and listening to the discussion on the floor, you have no doubt noted that \$4,879,571,000, or over half the total funds provided in the bill is for the Veterans' Administration. At first glance this must seem to be an unbelievable amount but it does not become so if you reflect on the fact that over 40 percent of the entire population of the United States is either entitled or potentially entitled to some form of benefit under programs administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The amount recommended for 1962 is \$545,127,000 less than the appropriations for this year and \$45,275,000 less than the budget estimates.

The bill provides \$27 million for medical research. This is \$5 million more than the budget estimate and demonstrates the committee's continued interest in this vital field. The bill also provides for a total of 139,372 operating beds, an increase of 903 over the current year, and an average daily patient load of 141,504 an increase of 629.

The Veterans' Administration Medical Director assured the committee that there is no waiting list at any Veterans' Administration hospital for veterans with a service connected complaint. There is however a substantial list of eligible veterans with non-service-connected disabilities awaiting veterans hospital admission.

The Members may find interesting a table supplied by the Veterans' Administration to the committee showing the average daily patient load in Veterans Administration hospitals. This table appears on page 501 of part I of the hearings:

#### PROGRAM NOTES—INPATIENT ACTIVITIES

##### *Average daily patient load in VA hospitals*

|                                    | Fiscal<br>year<br>1960,<br>actual | Fiscal<br>year<br>1961,<br>estimated | Fiscal<br>year<br>1962,<br>estimated | Increase<br>(+) or<br>decrease<br>(-) 1962<br>over 1961 |                                    | Fiscal<br>year<br>1960,<br>actual | Fiscal<br>year<br>1961,<br>estimated | Fiscal<br>year<br>1962,<br>estimated | Increase<br>(+) or<br>decrease<br>(-) 1962<br>over 1961 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| VA hospitals, total:               |                                   |                                      |                                      |   | TB hospitals:                      |                                   |                                      |                                      |   |
| Psychiatric patients.....          | 56,728                            | 56,900                               | 57,400                               | +500  | Psychiatric patients.....          | 12                                |                                      |                                      |   |
| TB, psychotic patients.....        | 1,079                             | 985                                  | 900                                  | -85   | TB, psychotic patients.....        | 1                                 |                                      |                                      |   |
| Tuberculous patients.....          | 7,958                             | 7,315                                | 6,700                                | -615  | Tuberculous patients.....          | 3,322                             | 2,504                                | 2,066                                | -438  |
| Neurologic patients.....           | 4,708                             | 4,700                                | 4,700                                |   | Neurologic patients.....           | 49                                | 40                                   | 30                                   | -10   |
| Medical and surgical patients..... | 40,935                            | 41,740                               | 42,550                               | +810  | Medical and surgical patients..... | 1,519                             | 1,117                                | 1,490                                | +373  |
| Total patients.....                | 111,408                           | 111,640                              | 112,250                              | +610  | Total patients.....                | 4,903                             | 3,661                                | 3,586                                | -75   |
| NP hospitals:                      |                                   |                                      |                                      |   | G.M. & S. hospitals:               |                                   |                                      |                                      |   |
| Psychiatric patients.....          | 49,305                            | 49,500                               | 50,000                               | +500  | Psychiatric patients.....          | 7,411                             | 7,400                                | 7,400                                |   |
| TB, psychotic patients.....        | 889                               | 805                                  | 750                                  | -55   | TB, psychotic patients.....        | 189                               | 180                                  | 150                                  | -30   |
| Tuberculous patients.....          | 38                                | 50                                   | 50                                   |   | Tuberculous patients.....          | 4,598                             | 4,761                                | 4,584                                | -177  |
| Neurologic patients.....           | 561                               | 550                                  | 550                                  |   | Neurologic patients.....           | 4,098                             | 4,110                                | 4,120                                | +10   |
| Medical and surgical patients..... | 1,634                             | 1,745                                | 2,038                                | +293  | Medical and surgical patients..... | 37,782                            | 38,878                               | 39,022                               | +144  |
| Total patients.....                | 52,427                            | 52,650                               | 53,388                               | +738  | Total patients.....                | 54,078                            | 55,329                               | 55,276                               | -53   |



Congress will soon be considering an omnibus housing bill which I understand will include a substantial number of new public housing units. Since the cost of the public housing program is always the subject of debate when housing bills are on the floor, I am going to include in my remarks at this point some tables taken from the hearings on this bill when the Public Housing Administration people were before the subcommittee.

The following is taken from pages 1020 and 1021 of part II of the hearings:

#### ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS REQUIREMENTS

The U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended, authorizes PHA to make annual contributions to local housing authorities to assist them in achieving and maintaining the low-rent character of housing eligible for Federal financial assistance under the act. These payments are made out of appropriated funds.

Under present requirements annual contributions are limited to amounts needed to liquidate capital indebtedness and may not be applied to current operating expenses. The amounts needed for this purpose are identified as "fixed annual contributions," but the amounts actually paid by PHA are normally lower than these fixed amounts, certain assets of the local housing authorities being available to reduce the obligation of the Federal Government. The most sub-

stantial of these "amounts available to reduce fixed annual contributions" are "residual receipts," which, generally speaking, represent the excess of rental income over operating expenses.

The estimate of annual contributions requirements for 1962 is \$169.3 million, as shown in the following table:

|   | 1960, actual  | 1961, estimate | 1962, estimate |
|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Number of projects.....                                     | 2,411         | 2,691          | 2,940          |
| Number of units.....  | 425,850       | 470,443        | 501,140        |
| Fixed annual contributions.....                             | \$147,523,103 | \$167,939,667  | \$186,915,962  |
| Amounts available to reduce fixed annual contributions..... | 16,334,726    | 16,278,650     | 17,659,638     |
| Annual contributions requirements.....                      | 131,188,377   | 151,661,017    | 169,256,324    |
| Rounded.....  |               | 151,700,000    | 169,300,000    |
| Appropriation.....  | 120,000,000   | 140,000,000    | 169,300,000    |
| Supplemental appropriation.....                             | 12,000,000    | 11,700,000     |                |
| Total.....  | 132,000,000   | 151,700,000    | 169,300,000    |
| Unobligated balance.....                                    | 811,623       |                |                |

The amounts available to reduce fixed annual contributions break down as follows:

|  | 1960 actual | 1961 estimate | 1962 estimate |
|--|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Accrued interest.....                                      | \$1,460,676 | \$3,181,663   | \$3,101,396   |
| Capitalized interest.....                                  | 1,144,652   | 1,184,051     | 3,397,488     |
| Residual receipts, initial operating period.....           | 698,537     | 153,329       | 302,460       |
| Residual receipts, after initial operating period.....     | 13,030,861  | 11,759,607    | 10,858,294    |
| Total amount available to reduce annual contributions..... | 16,334,726  | 16,278,650    | 17,659,638    |

Two other tables, taken from page 1022, contain some interesting information which will disclose project income, expense, residual receipts, and a tabulation of annual contributions from the inception of the public housing program in 1941 through June 30, 1962. The second following table shows that total annual contributions from the Federal Government to finance the public housing program since 1941 through 1962 amount to \$1,065,916,487. And remember that this is a 40-year program.

#### Statement of project income, expense, and residual receipts, locally owned projects eligible for annual contributions

| Classification  | 1960 actual |               | 1961 estimate |               | 1962 estimate |               |
|---|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|   | PUM         | Amount        | PUM           | Amount        | PUM           | Amount        |
| Operating receipts:                                   |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| Rental income.....                                    | \$38.25     | \$184,842,151 | \$39.50       | \$206,234,351 | \$39.28       | \$213,120,899 |
| Other income.....                                     | 1.08        | 5,201,546     | 1.14          | 5,963,685     | .93           | 5,056,957     |
| Total operating receipts.....                         | 39.33       | 190,043,697   | 40.64         | 212,198,036   | 40.21         | 218,177,856   |
| Operating expenditures:                               |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| Routine:  |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| Administration <sup>1</sup> .....                     | 6.33        | 30,603,750    | 7.33          | 38,257,304    | 7.51          | 40,746,292    |
| Utilities <sup>1</sup> .....                          | 8.79        | 42,500,108    | 9.24          | 48,217,168    | 9.27          | 50,302,698    |
| Ordinary maintenance and operation <sup>1</sup> ..... | 12.53       | 60,565,766    | 12.73         | 66,446,783    | 13.24         | 71,803,772    |
| Payments in lieu of taxes.....                        | 2.79        | 13,458,655    | 2.86          | 14,953,362    | 2.84          | 15,433,090    |
| Collection losses.....                                | .24         | 1,139,907     | .24           | 1,228,316     | .27           | 1,454,708     |
| Other general expenses <sup>1</sup> .....             | .81         | 3,915,792     | .82           | 4,310,711     | .79           | 4,274,783     |
| Total routine expenditures <sup>1</sup> .....         | 31.49       | 152,183,978   | 33.22         | 173,413,644   | 33.92         | 184,015,343   |
| Nonroutine:   |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| Extraordinary maintenance.....                        | \$0.85      | \$4,085,958   | \$1.86        | \$9,718,107   | \$2.00        | \$10,834,191  |
| Replacement of equipment.....                         | .44         | 2,135,405     | .60           | 3,138,855     | .65           | 3,551,637     |
| Betterments and additions.....                        | .89         | 4,323,731     | 1.33          | 6,940,679     | 1.10          | 5,977,843     |
| Other nonroutine expenditures.....                    | .01         | 36,301        | .02           | 106,746       | .01           | 61,317        |
| Miscellaneous adjustments.....                        | .08         | 403,139       | .06           | 337,108       | .12           | 635,724       |
| Total nonroutine expenditures <sup>1</sup> .....      | 2.27        | 10,984,534    | 3.87          | 20,241,495    | 3.88          | 21,060,712    |
| Provision for operating reserve.....                  | 2.87        | 13,844,324    | 1.30          | 6,783,290     | .41           | 2,243,507     |
| Total expenditures.....                               | 36.63       | 177,012,836   | 38.39         | 200,438,429   | 38.21         | 207,319,562   |
| Residual receipts.....                                | 2.70        | 13,030,861    | 2.25          | 11,759,607    | 2.00          | 10,858,294    |

<sup>1</sup> Because of changes in budget and accounting procedures, the 1960 figures for these items are not comparable with those for 1961 and 1962. For example, "Administra-

tion" now includes the cost of maintenance supervision and contribution to retirement funds, which were previously charged to other accounts.

#### Comparison of annual contributions from inception through June 30, 1962

| Fiscal year | Number of units | Fixed annual contributions | Amount available to reduce annual contributions | Accrued annual contributions | Percent of maximum | Average annual contributions |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| 1941.....   | 23,783          | \$4,747,176                |   | \$4,747,176                  | 100.0              | \$199.60                     |
| 1942.....   | 68,459          | 11,258,951                 | \$1,333,060                                     | 9,925,891                    | 88.2               | 144.99                       |
| 1943.....   | 89,240          | 13,049,252                 | 3,166,370                                       | 9,882,882                    | 75.7               | 110.47                       |
| 1944.....   | 101,951         | 14,436,885                 | 4,306,888                                       | 10,129,997                   | 70.2               | 99.36                        |
| 1945.....   | 141,596         | 21,132,572                 | 12,410,272                                      | 8,722,300                    | 41.3               | 61.60                        |
| 1946.....   | 144,095         | 21,115,314                 | 13,978,579                                      | 7,136,735                    | 33.8               | 49.53                        |
| 1947.....   | 144,095         | 21,044,261                 | 15,377,631                                      | 5,666,630                    | 26.9               | 39.33                        |
| 1948.....   | 144,603         | 21,044,002                 | 17,103,597                                      | 3,940,405                    | 18.7               | 27.25                        |
| 1949.....   | 145,785         | 21,325,747                 | 17,082,754                                      | 4,242,993                    | 19.9               | 29.10                        |
| 1950.....   | 146,549         | 21,321,123                 | 15,105,911                                      | 6,215,212                    | 29.2               | 42.41                        |
| 1951.....   | 145,703         | 21,407,822                 | 14,221,701                                      | 7,186,121                    | 33.6               | 49.32                        |
| 1952.....   | 156,084         | 26,215,103                 | 13,649,116                                      | 12,565,987                   | 47.9               | 80.51                        |
| 1953.....   | 204,815         | 45,091,605                 | 19,212,357                                      | 25,879,148                   | 57.4               | 126.35                       |
| 1954.....   | 259,116         | \$67,844,328               | \$23,376,836                                    | \$44,467,492                 | 65.5               | \$171.61                     |
| 1955.....   | 304,383         | 91,133,962                 | 24,548,099                                      | 66,585,863                   | 73.1               | 218.76                       |
| 1956.....   | 343,907         | 107,933,030                | 26,202,984                                      | 81,730,046                   | 75.7               | 237.65                       |
| 1957.....   | 365,896         | 116,685,509                | 26,050,696                                      | 90,634,813                   | 77.7               | 247.71                       |
| 1958.....   | 374,172         | 121,213,830                | 22,429,416                                      | 98,784,414                   | 81.4               | 264.01                       |
| 1959.....   | 401,467         | 133,106,635                | 17,739,971                                      | 115,366,664                  | 86.7               | 287.36                       |
| 1960.....   | 425,850         | 147,523,103                | 16,334,726                                      | 131,188,377                  | 88.9               | 308.06                       |
| Total.....  |                 | 1,048,630,110              | 303,630,964                                     | 744,999,146                  | 71.0               |                              |
| Estimate:   |                 |                            |   |                              |                    |                              |
| 1961.....   | 470,443         | 167,939,667                | 16,278,650                                      | 151,661,017                  | 90.3               | 322.38                       |
| 1962.....   | 501,140         | 186,915,962                | 17,659,638                                      | 169,256,324                  | 90.6               | 337.74                       |



Another table taken from page 1026 will show the increasing number of units year by year from 1941 through 1960, the accrued annual contributions made by the Federal Government to provide the subsidy, and the year-by-year PHA administrative expenses. In addition to the more than \$1 billion of contributions made by the Federal Government through fiscal year 1962, it is interesting to note that administrative expenses are in excess of \$125 million.

| Fiscal year | Number of units | Accrued annual contributions | PHA administrative expenses |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1941-----   | 23, 783         | \$4, 747, 176                | \$4, 073, 664               |
| 1942-----   | 68, 459         | 9, 925, 891                  | 4, 298, 392                 |
| 1943-----   | 89, 240         | 9, 882, 882                  | 3, 517, 915                 |
| 1944-----   | 101, 951        | 10, 129, 997                 | 3, 165, 000                 |
| 1945-----   | 141, 596        | 8, 722, 300                  | 2, 430, 200                 |
| 1946-----   | 144, 095        | 7, 136, 735                  | 1, 700, 200                 |
| 1947-----   | 144, 095        | 5, 666, 630                  | 3, 565, 000                 |
| 1948-----   | 144, 603        | 3, 940, 405                  | 2, 081, 710                 |
| 1949-----   | 145, 785        | 4, 242, 993                  | 2, 617, 000                 |
| 1950-----   | 146, 549        | 6, 215, 212                  | 6, 116, 233                 |
| 1951-----   | 145, 703        | 7, 186, 121                  | 9, 716, 718                 |
| 1952-----   | 156, 084        | 12, 565, 987                 | 9, 241, 900                 |
| 1953-----   | 204, 815        | 25, 879, 148                 | 8, 041, 330                 |
| 1954-----   | 259, 116        | 44, 467, 492                 | 6, 591, 200                 |
| 1955-----   | 304, 383        | 66, 585, 863                 | 7, 383, 900                 |
| 1956-----   | 343, 907        | 81, 730, 046                 | 9, 147, 700                 |
| 1957-----   | 365, 896        | 90, 634, 813                 | 9, 979, 766                 |
| 1958-----   | 374, 172        | 98, 784, 414                 | 11, 575, 230                |
| 1959-----   | 401, 467        | 115, 366, 664                | 12, 288, 362                |
| 1960-----   | 425, 850        | 131, 188, 377                | 12, 253, 957                |
| Total-----  | -----           | 744, 999, 146                | 129, 785, 177               |

Mr. Chairman, I regret that time will not permit a discussion of each item in this bill. Obviously one cannot devote attention to each of 23 separate agencies, or to a 50-page bill, or a 30-page report, in 20 minutes. I have therefore undertaken to address myself to a few specific items that have not been touched upon by other members of the subcommittee. Further opportunities will be given for more detailed discussion of individual items under the 5-minute rule.

In conclusion, I should like to pay my personal respects to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who has presided over the activities of the subcommittee with such grace and skill for many years. He is uniformly courteous to all members of the subcommittee and to witnesses appearing before it. I have learned many lessons from him during the period I have been privileged to serve as a member of his subcommittee and I am happy to join my colleagues on the subcommittee in paying a personal tribute to him today.

My association with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] has been equally rewarding. I have also appreciated the opportunity of working in close harmony on the subcommittee with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]; the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I apologize to the gentleman for leaving a moment ago, but I had to answer the telephone. Did I hear the gentleman say, as I was walking out of the Chamber, that there were 6,900

new employees provided for in this bill?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I am amazed. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Where are the bulk of these employees? Does the gentleman have a breakdown on that?

Mr. JONAS. Yes. 1,500 new employees for NASA; 1,487 new employees for Federal Aviation Agency. The gentleman from Iowa knows how rapidly aviation is expanding and they made a good case for additional employees in that agency to provide navigational aids, safety, and whatnot.

Mr. GROSS. On that point, let me ask the gentleman this question. Has the Federal Aviation Agency taken over, as was proposed a year or two ago, the manning of control towers on military bases?

Mr. JONAS. They have a coordinated arrangement with the military. The Federal Aviation Agency has primary responsibility in that field, I might say. Every one of these other regulatory agencies report to us that they just cannot keep up with increased workloads without adding new employees. The SEC has added workloads each year as additional securities are issued and are offered for sale to the public. We gave them an increase, but not nearly as much as they asked for. The Civil Service Commission has increasing obligations all over the country, and asked for an increase. We gave them a few more people. But I would like to call this point to the attention of the committee. The one agency in the entire Government that I recall asked for fewer employees in the coming fiscal year than last year is the General Accounting Office. General Campbell came in and said that they could do their work with 50 fewer employees. If there is any agency in this Government whose activities have expanded more than the General Accounting Office activities, I do not know what agency it would be because that is the office that has to "ride herd" on all of the other agencies and audit their accounts. This office frequently comes up with reports on waste and extravagance and has to supervise the financial transactions of all the other agencies. If the General Accounting Office can come in and voluntarily reduce their payroll and the number of employees, I do not see why some of these other agencies cannot do likewise.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I suspect the General Accounting Office has more employees on loan to and working with congressional committees than any other agency in this Government.

Mr. JONAS. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wonder if I could direct the attention of the gentleman to page 1176 of the subcommittee hearings on this bill and the list there of GSA building projects approved by the Congressional Public Works Committee,

which includes a project in Montpelier, Vt., for a courthouse and post office building to be completely designed in August 1961, and capable of contract award in October 1961, and also to the hearings at page 959 where this project is listed in the initially approved budget schedule for 1962. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can tell me the reasons why this project was omitted from the bill, as it has been reported to the floor of the House.

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to try to answer the gentleman. I know of his interest in this project. He has spoken to me about it before, and has been very active in his effort to have this project funded because it is an important project for his State. I am glad the gentleman asked the question here during the course of this debate, and I will try to clear the record and give as satisfactory an explanation as I can for the fact that the Montpelier project is not included in the bill. It is one of 28 projects that are in exactly the same status. They have all received committee approval. They have been authorized. The design and planning work has been completed in most of these projects, if not all. The only reason they were not considered in this bill is that they were not included in the budget. We have a substantial number of public buildings funded in this bill at a cost I might add of \$171,600,000; but the one at Montpelier, along with the 27 others listed from all sections of the United States, were not included because they were not budgeted and if they had been included the subcommittee would have had to go \$146 million over the budget. We just did not see our way clear to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, at Dyersburg, Tenn., a proposed Federal building is to be constructed. We have already bought the lot and the lot is clear. Plans are being drawn. It is the hometown of my able predecessor, the Honorable Jere Cooper. Can the gentleman tell me something about the status of that project in this bill?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I do not know of anyone who has been more diligent about a project than the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] has been about this one in Dyersburg, the hometown of our deceased colleague, Jere Cooper.

Here is the status of it: It is ready to go. We inquired of the General Services Administration if they would put it in next year's budget and ask the Bureau of the Budget for funds to begin a turn-key job. They said they would. We are going to do our best to hold them to their promise.

Mr. EVERETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, may I add that our distinguished colleague



from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] has certainly impressed the chairman and the members of the committee with his interest in this project. He has worked very diligently to bring this project to completion and to construction. He has rendered a real service and I congratulate my friend.

Over the years of my service on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. It has been a pleasure to serve with all members of this committee. I particularly want to pay my respects to our distinguished chairman and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I know AL THOMAS to be most efficient, very thorough, and he is certainly one of the most congenial Members of this Congress. My admiration for him has continued to increase over the years. It is certainly a pleasure to work with him, as it has been a source of pleasure of work with all members of the committee. I want to mention also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. Chairman, there is no partisanship shown in our committee. All of the members work together for the betterment of the country.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, represents more than 3 months of diligent, hard work and conscientious labor on the part of all members of the subcommittee. Our hearings comprise two volumes, or 2,570 pages. Along with the members of the committee I want also to commend our able assistant, Homer Skarin, and our other staff assistants.

This bill represents a fund request of some 23 agencies of Government. I shall not name them all, but they are our civilian agencies of Government: The Interstate Commerce Commission, which is one of the oldest and most important of our regulatory commissions; the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, Veterans' Administration, the new National Astronautics and Space Administration, the President's Base Council, the General Accounting Office, and others.

The total budget request for the 23 agencies was \$8,625,061,000. The committee has approved \$8,424,098,000, or a reduction of \$201,463,000. This is a substantial and a sizable reduction. The bill as compared with last year represents a reduction of \$69,945,400 less than the amount last year, notwithstanding the fact that a number of our agencies are accelerating their programs.

Although this is a big bill, and a good bill, I commend it to the favorable consideration of the membership of the House and urge its passage. These agencies of Government are all concerned with service and the protection of the public interest.

There has already been discussed the Veterans' Administration, which carries the largest amount of funds of all the agencies carried in this bill. Might I

say that with the Veterans' Administration we have the greatest veterans' program of any nation in the world. No nation in the world excels our country in providing benefits and various programs for the veterans. These include the medical program, hospitalization, medical care, in-patient care, out-patient care, research and development, compensation and pensions, housing, various educational and training programs. Some 5 million veterans have been given some type of education and training under the GI bill, including below and above college level. Through the years the veterans program of our country has been the greatest of any nation in the world.

The VA research program has been increased some \$5 million for next year. While the VA asked for some \$22 million for the medical care program, our committee provided them with \$27 million, or an increase of \$5 million, because we want our disabled veterans to have the best medical care and the best services provided to veterans of our country.

Concerning the national science and astronautics agency, we know that President Kennedy recently addressed a joint session of the Congress on this subject. The President pointed out the importance of this program. We know that the public is greatly interested in America forging ahead in space. With Astronaut Shepard vaulting into space, we have again shown to the world that America will not be second to any nation in space, defense, or otherwise.

This program is important from a national prestige point of view, but certainly it is costly. We have a very solid space program, and are moving forward on all fronts with our expensive space program. It is going to be costly, and we do not know what the future recommendations and costs will be in the years ahead.

The National Science Foundation is a tremendously important agency. I wish that all of our colleagues could have had the privilege of attending the hearings and receiving the benefits of the testimony of our scientists—such men as Dr. Detlaf Bronck of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Dr. Lee Do-bridge of California Institute of Technology, among others. We are forging ahead and making progress. We have made a reduction of \$250 million in this program, because it seems very difficult to supply all of the needs for the science fairs, the great programs of scholarships and fellowships, research and other science programs. Great programs are underway making grants for science scholarships and fellowships to advance our Nation in science.

The Federal Aviation Agency is also a tremendously important agency. The new Administrator, Mr. Najeeb Halaby, is a capable pilot as well as a fine Administrator. He is a very great American, we think, heading this important and significant Agency concerned not only with the development of aviation in America but also the control of air space and our relations with international air carriers.

I would point out, as was indicated in the report, that the Dulles International Airport has not moved forward as we have expected. It has been entirely too costly. It is going to be necessary to provide additional hangars and other facilities. A hangar has not been built thus far. Facilities for an immigration office for the Immigration Service is also required. This Agency is large and certainly an important one. They asked for \$744 million, and the committee approved \$724.5 million, or a cut of \$20.8 million for the Federal Aviation Agency.

Among the other regulatory agencies I would mention the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has been discussed; the Federal Power Commission, the National Capital Housing Authority, the General Accounting Office, and the Space Council for the President. It has been indicated that many of the agencies are faced with a tremendous backlog of work, and these agencies are supposed to serve, and in many instances do serve, the public interest. We think that their efforts should be improved, and the committee is trying to encourage these agencies to improve their services.

I commend the work of the regulatory agencies in their important work and commend the Landis report to their attention.

Referring again to the Veterans' Administration, I should like to mention that the compensation and pension item alone calls for some \$3.5 billion. This is a matter authorized by law, by statute, and the Committee on Appropriations necessarily has to provide the funds for this purpose. The veterans hospital construction program will, I understand, be discussed later. We have heard some complaint already on the floor that there has been a slight reduction in the funds for this program. Might I state that due to the efforts of our subcommittee a few years ago we inaugurated a renovation and modernization program for veterans hospitals. We have 173 veterans hospitals throughout the Nation, the largest and the greatest hospital and medical care program of any nation in the world, with an average daily patient load of approximately 120,000 patients per day. For the past several years we have been replacing Army barracks-type hospitals with modern, permanent structures, with improved medical facilities. We have been appropriating from \$50 million to \$75 million a year for this purpose. The bill carries \$70 million for next year for new hospital construction, and this subcommittee will provide all the needed and required funds for essential hospital construction.

Another important agency is the General Services Administration, which is a big agency, that provides many services for all agencies of the Government, including the control of Government office space and the building and construction of new Federal buildings. The bill carries funds for the construction of 21 new Federal buildings for next year—post offices and Federal buildings projects throughout the Nation. These are designated in the report. The report mentions 23 additional projects that are



advanced and are now making progress toward construction.

Mr. Chairman, again I wish to urge the passage of this bill in the public interest.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice in admiration and tribute to the gentleman from Texas, the fine chairman of this subcommittee, and to the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member. This is a hardworking subcommittee, with jurisdiction which is as broad as the jurisdiction of any committee in the Congress. When you look over the list of agencies for which this subcommittee is responsible you begin to realize the difficulty which is imposed upon the chairman and the members in trying to do a reasonably good job in giving these people the money they must have to operate, but not too much money.

I think the chairman of the committee will agree with me when I say that this bill is undoubtedly a bit on the generous side. We did not do as good a job in cutting on this bill as we have done in previous years. I trust, however, that when the shiny newness of the New Frontier has worn off a bit, we will settle down, and do a better job in years to come.

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times of May 27, 1961, carried an article which reported on a conference held in Tulsa, Okla., on May 26-27, which the Times called the first National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space.

This article is deserving of notice by the Members of this body because it reveals some rather peculiar items of information and it raises some very serious questions indeed.

Three of the top officials of NASA, Dr. Wernher von Braun, Dr. Robert Jastrow, and George M. Low attended this conference, ostensibly as representatives of NASA. I am therefore disturbed to learn that this conference, according to the Times, was sponsored by not only NASA, but by the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, all of us realize that the principal function of a chamber of commerce organization is to attract business and industry to locate in the area it serves. This, of course, is fitting and, I am sure, everyone recognizes the vital role the chambers of commerce in the United States have played in developing our economy to its present high point. Certainly I do not want anybody to think I am critical of the great city of Tulsa, to which city I had the privilege of making a visit some few weeks ago. I was well treated.

There are as many fine, intelligent people in the city of Tulsa as in any city I have ever visited, and their city is beautiful, well ordered, and prosperous.

But I must state frankly, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot avoid a nagging feeling that politics has intruded into our space program when I observe a number of top officials of a Government

agency, and a scientific agency at that, attending and participating in a conference when that conference is not wholly sponsored by a scientific organization and is not held in pursuance of any apparent scientific purpose.

I must say, further, that my suspicions are not at all mitigated when I recall that the new Administrator of NASA, Mr. James Webb, was, prior to his present appointment, an official of Kerr-McGee Oil Industries. Any similarity in the name Kerr-McGee and the name of a Member of the other body who also happens to be chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences is not coincidental.

I have made inquiries about this so-called First National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space and I believe that the Members of the House of Representatives are entitled to some further information from Mr. Webb.

As a member of the House Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, which must evaluate and act upon the appropriation request for NASA. I am personally familiar with the difficult and burdensome responsibilities which are carried by the top scientific and technical personnel of that agency. I know further that in carrying out the difficult assignment of having this Nation forge ahead of the Russians in space exploration, these scientific and technical experts are working long hours with dedication to their public duties. I also know that NASA has prided itself on being a nonpolitical agency, and that the agency has restored public confidence in the technical abilities of our country and has deserved and received the full support of the Congress for their programs. I agree fully that politics should not be utilized to cloud the effectiveness of that agency because science and technology cannot operate efficiently within a political environment. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Webb or other NASA administration officials should advise us of the following:

First. Who was responsible for originating the invitation for NASA personnel to participate in the conference held in Tulsa?

Second. How many NASA officials were present at the recent conference in Tulsa?

Third. Were the NASA personnel invited to speak at the conference by non-governmental individuals or were they instructed to go by Government officials?

Fourth. Were the NASA personnel traveling under Government orders and at Government expense?

Fifth. How much time did the top NASA personnel lose from their official Government responsibilities by participating in this conference?

Sixth. What scientific purpose did the conference at Tulsa further?

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times article reveals that the President broadcast a message to the conference in Tulsa which expressed the hope the meeting "would set a precedent for the Nation's dedication to its space effort." I believe that if the President intends to continue to ask the American people to support the large increase for our space ef-

forts as his recent money estimates for NASA has reflected and his recent messages to the Congress, our citizens are entitled to know to what extent politics has entered the administration of our space exploration program.

I just have one other question and comment to make on this matter. I would also like to have Mr. Webb tell, in addition to the other questions which I previously propounded to him, who kept the shop while everybody was in Tulsa.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will my friend of the loyal opposition yield for a question and tell me the name of the conference?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will be glad to. The name was the "First National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space." The article is in the New York Times of May 27, 1961.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I find I must take mild issue with my friend from Illinois who has just spoken on a statement which he previously made with regard to a portion of the General Services Administration known as the Transportation and Public Utilities Service. I agree with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that this is a very important service. I agree also, within limits, it has done a good job. But, where I disagree with him is in giving complete and utter approval to the methods that this bureau has used in doing its job. We have had much correspondence, and I think some other Members of the House have had much correspondence from bodies of State governments which are given the responsibility of regulating public utilities. This correspondence, by and large, complains about the role of the General Services Administration in dictating or attempting to dictate the methods by which these regulatory bodies determine rates which will be charged to the utility customers in the State. I think it is fine for this particular bureau to do a job of totaling figures to make sure that the formula, which is applied by the regulatory body, is applied properly. I think it is fine for this particular agency to protect the best interests of the Government as the consumer, but when it goes further than that, then it is not only acting in a way which is inimical, I think to the best interests of the State, but is acting in a way which is not contemplated by the organic act under which it was set up. Further, it is dangerously close to infringing upon the territory of the Federal Power Commission in some instances, the Interstate Commerce Commission in other instances, and the Federal Trade Commission in other instances. So it would be my hope this particular bureau will take to heart the colloquy which we had with its members in the committee and the words which are set forth in the committee report with reference to it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I believe the record will show that the committee received a copy



of the resolution adopted by the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissions which is a nationwide association of State regulatory agencies. It was somewhat critical of the activity of this department in the General Services Administration, and the members of the subcommittee went into the matter quite carefully and thoroughly when the new Administrator of the GSA and his associates were before the committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I think the record will also show that the gentleman who presented the resolution on behalf of the Association of Railroad and Public Utilities Commissioners, under questioning took the position which may be the position, too, of the gentleman from Arizona really for this agency, and that is this: "Go into battle for the Government, but do not take any weapons with you. Fight, but in moderation. Do not be too aggressive." This agency acts as an advocate. It acts as a lawyer. As a lawyer representing the Government as a consumer, it has every right and every responsibility to present arguments before the forum in which it appears why it thinks rates are exorbitant. The burden is still with the court or with the regulatory agency before whom it advances its arguments to decide whether its arguments are correct. The court or the commission may accept the arguments if it decides they are right, and it may reject them if it decides they are wrong. This agency of the General Services Administration in acting as an advocate, as a lawyer in the case, should be allowed to present every proper legal position to protect the interests of the Government and the taxpayers.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, the gentleman and I disagreed on this in the subcommittee. I have all the respect in the world for his views; however, I submit to the House that this Bureau should not act as a lawyer, or as an advocate of any particular theory of computation of utility rates. Its function goes only to the principle that whatever rules of ratemaking the Public Service Commission applies should be applied properly. It has nothing to do with the dictation of those rules, and it has nothing to do with the advocacy of other rules. It is up to the Public Service Commission to adopt its own rules. As a representative of the Government certainly this agency has the responsibility to make sure that the figures are added correctly and that the formulas are applied accurately.

I also want to mention one other agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission. I note it has received a cut of only \$15,000. I am pleased this agency was given almost everything it asked for, because in this day of intense activity in dealing in equitable securities, its function is even more important than it had been previously. This agency must be given the tools with which to protect the investing public.

I would also call attention to the fact on page 13 of the report we mention

another revolving fund. Some day I hope that the House of Representatives, or the Appropriations Committee will do a study on the number of revolving funds which exist in the Federal Government. I imagine we will come up with a very staggering sum of money which is in so-called revolving funds which have been completely forgotten about by the people who first set them up; and we will probably find much Federal money in these funds which could be released for other purposes. I hope we will undertake a study of these funds in the not too distant future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Texas a few questions concerning the bill. I would like to say by way of preface that I did not have the time to do a very good job of reading the hearings.

I would like to ask the gentleman about the Chantilly, Va., airport, since I have not heard it mentioned today. Let me see if I have this situation in proper perspective. As I understand, the committee was told originally that this airport would cost \$84,900,000. I believe the committee has appropriated approximately \$85 million, and this bill contains some \$26 million for construction of this airport. The committee has been told, furthermore, that before it is finally completed it is going to cost \$175 million. Am I approximately correct in my understanding?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman has not missed one item.

Mr. GROSS. What does the committee propose to do about continuing to appropriate for this proposition, and if so, under what circumstances?

Mr. THOMAS. I think the gentleman has put his finger on the meat in the coconut right here. What has happened to date is simply this: You have an overrun, and you can spell it out any way you want to as to what caused it, this, that, or the other thing, but it is still an overrun.

The difference between the amount appropriated to date, about \$111 million, and the estimated completion cost the gentleman gave of approximately \$175 million is going to be on shops and hangars.

Frankly, I do not see any reason why the Federal Government should build them. If you will read the committee hearings carefully you will find that the present Administrator and his predecessor, General Quesada, are very fine, hard-working, intelligent public servants. Some of his people made some errors in calculations, and other errors have been made.

Those two gentlemen have gone to the airlines and said "You have to have some hangars out there. Why do you not go out and build your own like you do in most other big places?"

They came back and said "Money is tight right now, we do not have it, we are up against hard times." They were not able to get the airlines to build them so we had to appropriate \$6 million. But let me point this out—it is in the committee report—we suggested and almost told FAA "When you sign up with these big airplane companies, do not do like you did at the National Airport, make a 20-year contract and bind the Government for that long period of time. That is childish. You amortize the land cost, interest, depreciation, maintenance on these hangars in 20 or 25 years, and the taxpayers will get every penny back."

The Washington National Airport out here has made \$300,000 net this year and expects to make \$600,000 in 1962. It should have been more than that if they had not been tied up with a 20-year contract.

Mr. GROSS. This is money supplied by all the taxpayers of the United States that is being spent on this airport?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I think I am right in saying that.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. GROSS. It was promised to have an operating airport by July 1, 1961. Now they say maybe in 18 months. At least, that is what I understand, maybe in 18 months from now they will have an operating airport at Chantilly.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The hearings show there has apparently been somebody or perhaps several somebodies who did not do their job, who have mismanaged this project or did not do a good job. Somebody is responsible for this situation. Who is it?

Mr. THOMAS. You are asking me a direct question, and I will give the gentleman a direct answer.

General Quesada was the man who was supposed to be head of the agency. It was somebody on his staff that misqu岸 on the estimate. I do not think there is anything morally wrong with it, but they miscalculated.

Mr. GROSS. Is there no one who can be held to account for a situation of this kind that is going to cost the taxpayers of this country for this completed airport a huge additional sum of money? I believe you have said in your report that this \$20 million is the end; that those responsible will have to go somewhere else to get additional money for this project. But I wonder what you are going to do if the \$26 million will not do the job.

Mr. THOMAS. They wanted some facilities, and so forth, out there. We said within these funds you get out and provide that space, and I believe they will.

Let me go on. It is easy for us to say this is wrong, and that is wrong, but from what I have seen these overruns are not any different in government than in private industry.

Here is where the original mistake was made. When this money was appropriated 3 or 3½ years ago, the Department of Commerce then was in charge



of the whole thing. I remember I talked with the top people in Commerce about this matter. I said "I have talked with some people who have had a lot of experience in heavy construction matters and they suggest you ought to get a top contractor, make a negotiated contract with him to go out and work for you and pay him for working for you, and let him get out and employ the rest of these contractors to do the job for two reasons: you will save 10 to 15 percent in construction cost and at least 20 percent in construction time."

They did not do that. They let little contracts to this fellow, little contracts to that fellow and the other fellow, and when we got through everybody was behind. You had bad weather and other things which added up to the overrun in time and in money.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is Congress going to be asked to spend additional money of the taxpayers of this country to build a high-speed road to this airport? Is there anything in this bill for that?

Mr. THOMAS. That money has already been appropriated. Maybe we ought to put some tolls on it and get some money back.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think it should be said that hindsight is always better than foresight. We have not detected any misconduct or anything wrong that transpired out there. The whole story is that we were given an estimate several years ago as to what this airport would cost, and it turned out to be too low. Now, that is not unheard of in Government, and I could cite the gentleman from Iowa a lot of more staggering situations than this one in some missile site construction contracts and other construction contracts in which the Federal Government has been involved. But, the reason I asked the gentleman to yield was because I think the RECORD right at this point might well contain the answer of Mr. Pyle, who has been Deputy Administrator for a number of years and who was before the committee with the new Administrator. I asked him the question which appears on page 77 to explain the change in testimony as to when the airport would be completed and the additional cost, and here is his response:

Mr. PYLE. I will answer that. Mr. Tippetts may want to supplement it, but I will take the responsibility for this. First, I think the Agency was at fault. I think there is no sense beating around the bush. We did not do a good job. We had some internal problems that resulted in this situation.

Secondly, we did have a series of difficulties beyond our control with weather. This is partially responsible. If you will remember, the previous fall was a very wet one and we had to suspend all construction for a period of 4 or 5 months because we just could not work any of the dirt; it was just muck, and we had to suspend all grading and drainage.

Last winter, as you know, was a very rough winter and we had not advanced to the point we could do interior work; it was still outside work; so the weather last winter

was a tremendous hinderance, the snow particularly. So these two factors contributed to the delay. This is not detailed, but this is it.

Mr. GROSS. Well, let me just respond to that, and then I will yield to the gentleman. As to weather, we did have bad weather here last winter, there is no question about that, but that does not explain this part of his statement which says "We didn't do a good job; we had some internal problems." What I want to know is what were those internal problems? Who was responsible for the internal problems? Who was responsible for the fact that they did not do a good job? I cannot quite pass this off on the basis that "confession is good for the soul" or that this was just an "overrun"—when the overrun on the originally estimated cost of this thing runs into millions upon millions of dollars. Now, you just cannot pass it off lightly; at least, I cannot.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me correct one remark. The overrun is not going to be anything like two to one. The original estimate was around \$85 million or \$90 million or \$100 million without hangars. Now, when you go to building hangars, you must spend more. It is bad enough. We are not condoning it.

Now, let us look at the overall figure there. It is \$175 million with hangars. Idlewild Airport in New York is costing what? \$300 million. The big Los Angeles Airport in California with hangars is costing what? \$265 million. New York is twice as big as Washington.

Mr. GROSS. I have no way of knowing what they are putting up in Idlewild. All I am concerned about is what they are doing here. But, let us complete the record right here. This is Mr. JONAS again, on page 77 of the hearings:

Mr. JONAS. This committee did not think so, but were we not told this airport could be built for \$84.9 million?

Mr. PYLE. I think that is a fair statement, Mr. JONAS.

I think we ought to have that on the record; and hangars are certainly part of a completed airport.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I suggest that you add the next question and answer.

Mr. JONAS. What has caused the increase in estimated cost?

Mr. PYLE. Part is due to the factors that went into my first answer—lack of adequate management, administration of the contract, a certain amount of factors due to weather, which meant the contractor legally within his contract had certain expenses which were legitimate under the contract which were going on all the time.

I think it was a combination of circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Sure, it was a combination of circumstances, but that does not help the debt-ridden taxpayers of this country, and I do not mean to be abrupt with my good friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am just as much interested in the debt-ridden taxpayers as any Member of this body.

Mr. GROSS. I know the gentleman is.

Mr. JONAS. And we wrote into the report a definite requirement, as far as we can, requiring that every dime of this investment will have to be recovered from fees paid by users of this airport, including the interest, I might say.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Speaking of the debt-ridden taxpayers, I do not think the taxpayers of this country have a greater advocate than the gentleman from Iowa. He is consistently on the floor and is more or less the watchdog of the U.S. Treasury, attempting to protect the overburdened taxpayer.

Getting down to this specific grant for the Dulles International Airport, are we not faced with the same situation in many other Government projects? For instance, they underestimated the highway trust fund about \$11 billion. Is that about correct?

Mr. GROSS. I think that is right.

Mr. DEVINE. Then this building right across the street, what they call the additional House Office Building.

Although I was not in the Congress when this extravagant building was approved in 1955, I believe the estimates for that were \$64 million; and they now tell us it will cost in excess of \$100 million. It seems to me we should thoroughly analyze the entire system of obtaining estimates for all Government projects, and confine expenditure at least within a percentage of these estimates that have time and again proven absolutely unreliable and useless.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I commend him for his consistent position in opposition to wasteful spending.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to complete the history of the Dulles Airport for the gentleman. It does not make me too happy to do this, but the original legislation that went into the supplemental bill, and I offered the amendment, provided for appropriations for this airport for Washington. At the time of that discussion on the floor I stated to the House it would cost approximately \$60 million. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] opposed it and gave the astonishing figure that it might even run up to \$100 million. However, the original estimate that came in when this legislation started, which was a supplemental appropriation, was \$60 million. We had been assured it would not run over \$60 million. That is why the project was originally adopted by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I know the gentleman was deeply interested in this matter when it was originally presented to the Congress, and with him I thought the cost would be far less than the amount already spent.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.



Mr. JONAS. The subcommittee is in a difficult position. Here we have an airport half completed. What are we going to do, just say that because somebody made a mistake a year ago and because we had snow and wet weather we are going to stop construction, or are we going to do our best to tie down these additional costs and try to put in some restrictions that will make sure we will recover all the costs? The committee did the best it could under those circumstances. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa is speaking not critically of the subcommittee, because we did what we could to protect the taxpayers and the Government when we found ourselves faced with the situation that developed.

Mr. GROSS. But the fact remains the taxpayers are the losers in a deal of this kind.

Mr. JONAS. What could we do?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what the committee could do except to have somebody ride herd on this thing. Somebody must be made responsible for failures and internal trouble that costs millions of dollars.

Mr. JONAS. That is what we are doing. If the gentleman will read the report, I believe he will find it cannot be any stronger. How can our subcommittee go beyond that point? We have said that we believe this airport ought to be completed within the limits of the additional appropriation, and we expect contracts to be let with users subject to being renewed every 3 years, which will result in recovering all of the cost.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, because I am far from satisfied that the taxpayers should be saddled with the rocketing expense of construction of the Chantilly airport, and because I learn to my amazement that this one appropriation bill will add 6,900 employees to the Government payrolls, I must vote against it. These are but two of several reasons why I take a position in opposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask several questions of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, in regard to the appropriations for the Federal Housing Administration. We know that this appropriation is an educated guess. I am sure the committee has made the best educated guess it could. I notice that the Administration has requested \$63,300,000 for nonadministrative expense.

I hear from builders in my area and throughout California of the tremendous lag in approval of applications amounting to 6 to 8 weeks. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency in connection with the recent hearings on the 1961 housing bill the situation with respect to the approval of applications is very uneven throughout the country. A lot of this may be due to the failure to allocate personnel.

On the other hand, is it not possible that the \$62,300,000 requested by the Administration might be more appropriate

than the sum allotted in the bill as presented to us this afternoon?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my friend that I think he has put his finger on the main problem. I sometimes doubt whether the personnel have been properly used. As the gentleman has said, this is national in scope in connection with insurance all over the country. The gentleman's section is growing and growing. Perhaps other sections are losing population. Perhaps other are static.

I have often thought they could shift personnel from downtown, particularly, these experts—the architects, the appraisers, and so forth. The big cost of FHA is putting business on the books—you understand what I mean by that. The big year of the FHA for its non-administrative expenses was 1959. Do you know how much money they had then? They had \$46 million.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Of course, the problem is growing geometrically rather than arithmetically.

Mr. THOMAS. They did not do as much business in 1960 and 1961 as they did in 1959. Yet, they only had \$46 million. Now they come in and ask for an increase of \$10 million more than they had last year, and they did not do near the business they did in 1959 with a \$46 million appropriation. Of course, they did not have the pay act, and that has increased the cost a little bit. This is their money that they are spending and we have been very, very generous, in my humble judgment. We are giving them \$5 million more than they had last year. Do you know how many employees that will give them more than they had last year? It will give them 500 more.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Would the gentleman say the situation has changed? The recent press releases I see coming out of Washington and elsewhere indicate that housing is in for a real boom. The administration of the new housing law is going to present new problems. On this basis, will the committee consider additional appropriations?

Mr. THOMAS. We do not have the slightest idea of doing anything except to help them and keep them abreast of their backlog and to keep houses moving.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I may say to the gentleman that the principal FHA builder in the city of San Francisco said he could put 200 people to work at once if he could get the applications through the local FHA office, now running 60 days behind.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope he is correct. We will try to help him get all the employees. We want to help you out. We will talk to the office here and ask them to send them out there. But you know we are disturbed about the optimism—the thing that impressed our committee most of all was the foreclosures going on in the FHA.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. That is an administrative expense.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, I suspect that most of the expenses are nonadministrative expenses in the field. But let us push ahead. Whatever funds they

need should not occasion having to wait longer than 4 weeks, in my judgment, for processing of applications.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I read nothing in the hearings that would indicate there would be any change one way or another.

Mr. THOMAS. We do not want to hurt. We want to help.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I respectfully invite the gentleman's attention to the report of the committee in which it is pointed out that the increased appropriation granted by the committee in this bill will provide funds for about 500 new jobs to handle the increased work and most of them will be in field office. I assume, and it is the committee's intention that the new jobs will go into the field offices for the most part to ease the burden of such offices as in San Francisco.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think at this point it would be well for the record to show that they just have 7,000 employees now and we are giving them money in this bill for 500 more, and that is a pretty good increase.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. The difficulty may well lie in the allocation of personnel in the various offices. At the same time, the large increase in funds requested by the administration may merely be an indication of resolving the unmet need left over from the past. The previous administration sought to avoid housing problems rather than solve them. The fact that a substantial increase in administrative funds have been requested means little in itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, permit me to express gratitude to the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is talking about the cost of the construction of Federal buildings. Apparently, members of the committee thought the committee was being criticized. We are not critical of the committee or of any member of the committee. The committee has a tremendous task. Expressions of disapproval of their work have not been heard. This excessive cost of the construction of public buildings is something we cannot avoid very well under our present procedure. The chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. JONAS], who has done an exceptionally fine job, said that if we had a building started and storms and snow come along, what would we do? We would have to finish it, of course. But these errors that come up all the time in the estimates of cost are so continuous that suspicious individuals like your humble servant have an idea that is a planned



part of the procedure. Contractors come along just like some salesmen. I notice the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], is present, and I almost believe, although I am taking a chance, that he would agree with me that that is just what contractors do when public money is used—they come along with a little deal and sell us something, intending all the time to build something bigger. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] nods his head—is that right?

Mr. CANNON. It is a consistent practice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is just a practice—yes, and until we draw the line some time, and I just do not know when we will do it, and I note the leader of the majority party is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CANNON] is here. The gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, and the majority leader are very astute, able and experienced Members. It may be they can devise procedure to correct the practice.

I know that if these two gentlemen will put their minds to it they will find a way in advance before the horse is stolen to make these fellows build these structures in accordance with the original estimate. It will be a tremendous task, but I believe it can be done.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Permit me at this point to read into the RECORD a statement from the committee report for the benefit of those who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and this colloquy and debate but who will not have access to the report, just one short paragraph. May I read it in the gentleman's time?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JONAS. I read the following from page 7 of the report:

The committee wants to impress upon the agency that all fees and rentals for this airport, hangars and facilities should be at a figure that is sufficient to amortize the entire cost of acquiring land, construction, maintenance, and interest over a reasonable period of no longer than 20 to 25 years, and that escape clauses should be in all contracts whereby the Government can re-evaluate them every 3 years or less.

That means that the committee thinks the rental fee should be on a basis which would amortize the cost of the hangars in 25 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but where does that get us? The airport is ready for use, but they cannot get anybody to use it because the fees are too high. It will be just like some of the loans on foreign aid. The gentleman knows how they turn out.

Mr. JONAS. I do not see what more the subcommittee could do than we did.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not criticizing the subcommittee at all. You are just caught in the wringer, that is all. Unless these two gentlemen to whom I refer here who have so much power and influence in the House, unless they can stop it, it will continue just like the office building over there, almost the largest building on the Hill, if it is

not the largest. I heard the other day where we are going to—not we, but the Congressmen who follow us—are going to have three rooms and two lavatories. A taxpayer came along and asked me, What about the shower? Are they going to put showers in there? I cannot find out. I tried to get my industrious friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], to learn what he could about it. He has not been able to get it. I talked to the contractor down there. I have known him a good many years. He helped elect, or erect, the Democrats. He has worked on several buildings up here on the Hill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would yield me a little extra time so that I can get your mind off the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When they were talking about the bathrooms for Congressmen in this building, he asked, are they going to be like the ones over here in the Teamsters Building? He said over there a little shower cost \$50,000 to \$75,000. I think he bid on it but he did not win out.

So you see how those things creep into these buildings after we make the original estimate. That is the trouble all the time.

I listened last night to our President. He made a wonderful talk, and as I got it, it was a plea for additional foreign aid to avert the danger we were in which, of course, we are in. I gathered from what he said—I think he did not say that, but just from his manner and his implications that his conferees, the men who conferred with him over there—had told him that there was not going to be any war because we were hanging ourselves by excessive spending, that they would take over after a while when we went bankrupt, when our currency became of no value. I have often wondered. I look sometimes to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri, who sits here, and I feel highly honored to think that he would even stay here for the few minutes while I talk—I wonder sometimes if he would express an opinion on where we are going in this spending.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is the new 5-year plan. Communists, the Russians, you know, started this 5-year plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We started it long before that. You were not here when we started it.

Mr. GROSS. We are going to get it, the 5-year plan in foreign giveaways.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is called a 5-year plan?

Mr. GROSS. It will be called a 5-year plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it now?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You did not tell me about that.

Mr. GROSS. The proposal is for a 5-year plan. That was the 5-year plan which was supposed to have ended in 1962.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know this, so does every Member of the House, for years and years we have been disregarding the good, sound advice that F.D.R. gave us in October 1932. That is not to spend except in emergencies more than we made, because the inevitable result is bankruptcy.

As the picture comes to me, all these things are desirable, but we are ruining ourselves by continually—the House is a party to it—spending more and more money. You can call it progress if you want to, but we all know where the end is, and until the House revolts and turns down some of these bills and sends them back to the committee with instructions to cut, the practice will go on.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I note that the bill includes \$1.2 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In this connection it seems to me the time has come to take a long second look at some of the things the President of the United States is asking us to spend money for. I have specifically in mind his most recent proposal of a crash program to put a man on the moon. Certain cost figures have been put forward in connection with this project. Nine billion dollars has been mentioned. But I notice that Dr. Hugh Dryden of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration thinks \$20 or \$40 billion over a 10-year period might be a closer estimate.

I am sure the President has thought this proposal over carefully. So have I. He has made his decision. And so have I.

Very frankly, I am convinced this crash moon trip is a spectacular piece of nonsense which may very well distract the public from such matters as Cuba and Laos and Berlin, but will produce very little of merit compared with the cost.

And let us all admit that neither the White House nor the Congress nor the Bureau of the Budget has any real notion of what such a project would cost. No one does. Nor can anyone say for sure whether it will produce any really vital new knowledge, or reinforce our military position in any way.

If I thought otherwise I would support it wholeheartedly.

The President, quite naturally, is concerned with national prestige. And well he might be when it is recalled what has happened to our prestige since he took office.

But neither he nor anyone can say what our prestige will be by the time this project could be accomplished. It might well be that another administration of a different political persuasion would be in office, removing any need to bolster up our prestige.

Since I am not a scientist, I have checked with a number of men who are,



about this project. Some, of course, are favorable. But there is a considerable weight of opinion opposed.

Among these is Dr. Vannevar Bush, a man who has spent much time in Washington both with the Government and as president of Carnegie Institution. He is now honorary chairman of the board, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

He advised me that in his judgment the moon trip is "not worth a darn"—though he asked me to sweeten up the quotation just a bit.

Dr. Bush continued:

We get some information out of this kind of thing, but it is utterly incommensurate with the cost. We might better be investing more in finding a cure for cancer, or converting sea water to fresh water. Or we might even try saving a little money for the benefit of the taxpayers.

Again, I am advised that Rev. Francis J. Heyden, S.J., director, Georgetown College Observatory here, has a poor opinion of the moon trip as a likely source of data for his science.

Dr. Heyden points out that the lack of atmosphere on the moon is both an advantage and a disadvantage. It is a disadvantage because it would mean that a man attempting to make astronomical observations on the moon would need to build a huge capsule not only to provide him a place to breathe, but to protect him from a wide variety of dangerous cosmic radiation.

The advantage lies in the moon's lack of atmosphere which would provide a clearer view of the heavens. But this same advantage can be had with a communications satellite which would cost far less and take less time to develop. For the immediate future, a balloon capable of reaching high altitudes beyond the rim of the atmosphere, could be equipped with cameras to take astronomical pictures, according to Father Heyden.

Not long ago, another eminent scientist, Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, the nuclear physicist, was critical of the President's moon proposal in remarks in the Washington Academy of Sciences. He chose the convenient figure of \$25 billion as the cost.

Dr. Lapp said there are no reliable standards on which to judge the value of a moon shot. But he said if scientists had \$25 billion to spend they would rather spread it on more promising research programs. He said the administration's proposal was political rather than scientific, and there I think he hit the nail on the head.

Dr. Lapp's views have been seconded by Dr. Philip Abelson, director of the Geophysical Laboratory of the Carnegie Institution and president of the Washington Academy of Sciences.

It seems to me that when we realize that this moon shot would cost more than it cost to build our entire railroad system, or as much as our whole defense budget for a single year, that Congress, too, had better stop and think.

Today, the administration's spending plans, including social security, are more than \$100 billion a year. The burden on the economy not only will create an-

other round of inflation, but will slow down economic growth. At this point, with unavoidable increases in military costs facing us for an indefinite period, do we really need a costly political stunt? After all, the moon shot, which most scientists shun, is the most inflationary proposal in American political history.

Is there any reason why the American taxpayer should be asked to carry the financial burden of nearly half the earth—and at the same time help finance the next Democratic presidential campaign?

I have made my decision. My answer is "No."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time for the purpose of asking for some information from the chairman of the subcommittee about the Interstate Commerce Commission. At the beginning of the session I introduced a resolution requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to reevaluate and to change and institute new safety protection regulations for the transportation of explosives over the highways. After that was introduced they agreed with the railway brotherhoods that they would instigate an investigation of their own if the resolution was not pressed, and indicated that they would need at least \$40,000 for the investigation. What I would like to know is: Did they make a request for any money for an investigation of that kind?

Mr. THOMAS. I remember discussing this matter with our distinguished colleague. He has been very interested in it. I do not think they did; in fact, I am positive. Is there anybody on the subcommittee that knows whether that request was made for \$40,000 for an investigation of explosives traveling over the highways? We never heard of it. It is not specifically requested, but they do and are doing this kind of studies.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to thank the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to register my opposition to the increased appropriation for the Federal Power Commission. On page 8 of the report the committee approved the full \$8,793,000 budget estimate for the Commission. This is an increase of \$629,500 over the 1961 appropriation. You may wonder why I am protesting. I am protesting on the ground that the service they are rendering is a disservice to America. For instance, within the last 4 years the Federal Power Commission has issued certificates of convenience and necessity to American producers of gas in Canada, six in all, and two in Mexico. Do you know how much gas was authorized to come into this country daily under certificates of convenience and necessity issued by the Federal Power Commission within the last 4 years? Daily, 1,257 million cubic feet in competition with other fuels, such as coal, natural gas, electricity, and whatever other conventional fuel you might have.

Now, when I say I am protesting this, I mean I am protesting it for the simple reason that under the reciprocal trade agreement, which the State Department said I would violate if the legislation I was proposing was approved, they did not advise the American people that the same trade agreements which they went over to Geneva and drew up in 1957—that allows natural gas to come in from Canada and Mexico on the free list—they did not tell them that the same lousy trade agreement requires us to pay 50 cents a ton on every ton of coal we export into Canada. If the Members of this House expect me to keep quiet about discrimination of this kind, they do not know the Congressman from West Virginia.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask some questions about the translating program under the National Science Foundation. Under Public Law 480, by which our U.S. agencies sell and dispose of U.S. agricultural surpluses abroad, there is a provision that provides that those funds in local currencies can be used for various purposes, and one of those purposes, according to the amendment I helped sponsor, is the translation of various material, such as monographs, scientific material, and books, items of that kind.

The sum to be appropriated under this bill for such translation program has been in the amount of \$2 million, and I notice that the National Science Foundation has used only \$609,000 for this purpose this year. The estimates for 1962 include a separate appropriation item to purchase \$2 million worth of foreign currencies to collect and translate scientific information. Thus purchase is to be made by the National Science Foundation when desired. Obviously, when the National Science Foundation has to purchase these foreign currencies with U.S. dollars, it does not make any difference whether they purchase them or not, as these foreign currencies owned by U.S. agencies are charged against the dollar budget of the agency. It should be our U.S. policy to use these foreign currencies now held in the U.S. Treasury as surplus, for translation of books and publications, and the purchase of necessary scientific and research books and treatises. What good does it do to have these foreign currencies owned by the United States lie around unused?

From the point of view of the American people we should be using these foreign currencies in the countries where we have either sent foreign aid or sold U.S. agricultural surpluses abroad.

To accomplish this, we should have a change in congressional appropriation procedures and appropriate these U.S.-owned foreign currencies in kind from the U.S. Treasury. Why cannot we have new appropriation procedures? I do not see anything in the Constitution of the United States that requires appropriations to be in U.S. dollars. We in the United States have assets such as



foreign currencies that belong to us. Why do we not simply appropriate the U.S.-owned foreign currencies and get these U.S. agencies to use them up instead of requiring our U.S. agencies to buy them for dollars, and have their budgets charged with the dollar amounts.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the gentleman is right in his thinking, except that the law states that before any agency of Government can get any of these currencies out of the Treasury it must come with American dollars in hand to the Treasury to get them.

Mr. FULTON. The point I am making is that there is nothing in the Constitution which makes the basic law that the U.S. Congress must appropriate in dollars, so it is simply a previous and amendable statute of the U.S. Congress that now says that all currencies in the U.S. Treasury must be appropriated in dollars. When we have in the U.S. Treasury foreign currencies lying there, why do we not just simply appropriate these U.S.-owned foreign currencies as is?

The reason I say we need it is this: Dr. Waterman said in his testimony before this committee in regard to the translation from Russian of foreign periodicals and materials, "We translate about 45 periodicals." As a Congressman I have looked into this question previously and find that on an exchange agreement with Russia we exchange with Russia each year over 85,000 various items apiece in 1 calendar year.

So coming from Russia to us are over 85,000 items to the Library of Congress and other U.S. agencies, and in the National Science Foundation we are now translating 45 periodicals of a scientific nature. What a travesty. We could save money by appropriating this foreign currency in kind from the U.S. Treasury. I wish the Appropriations Committee would think of that.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. We have \$1.6 million in this bill for the use of foreign currencies by these agencies.

Mr. FULTON. Obviously the U.S. agencies will not use that amount because they have to get these appropriations in dollars and buy the foreign currencies that are U.S. owned from the U.S. Treasury in dollars, and our U.S. agencies do not want the dollars added to their budget amounts, as the agencies will be squeezed on some other program or part of their budget.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Much of the foreign currency is available only under conditions set by other governments. The foreign money we have we cannot spend freely.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address a few remarks to the "Operating expenses, transportation, and public utilities service," an item in the General Services Administration appropriation. I note that the committee is doing its careful review of the func-

tions of this activity has cut the 1962 budget estimate by \$25,000, recommending an appropriation of \$2,475,000.

From a reading of the hearings which were held, it is evident that the committee has carefully considered not only the functions, but the worthwhile contribution and performance of this activity. While we are spending \$2,475,000 for these activities, the record indicates that savings or transportation reduction in rate charges has amounted to \$15.7 million for fiscal year 1960, and has saved a similar amount in its appearances before regulatory bodies, principally in connection with the SAGE-Air Force communication projects. Despite considerable opposition and criticism from the communication industry in particular, I feel that the interest of the taxpayer has been protected fully by the existence of this fine organization. In 1955, I, among others, urged its creation. It has continued since that time with a credible record in economies and exercise of transportation leadership.

I believe it is to the credit of General Services Administration that, despite the militant efforts of some quarters of industry to obscure its accomplishments, the performance of this activity has not been altered nor its organization broken up and scattered among other agency elements in order to avoid clear-cut identity and responsibility in the field of transportation and public utility management. This activity has a duty to represent the executive agencies as a shipper or user of utility services before Federal and State regulatory bodies. It is proper that the Government be represented before these bodies in this guise, which is unrelated to any sovereign capacity on the part of the Federal Government, and I hope that the General Services Administration will continue to exercise this necessary function. I have closely watched and followed closely this activity and I shall continue to do so.

I know of your interest in the subject matter which this appropriation is designed to protect, and I know that the many House Members as well, who have evidenced a continuing interest in the past, will watch the performance of this function carefully in the future.

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended on its extensive inquiry into the funding and work of this activity. The amount granted appears to be adequate at this time, and certainly, based on the programs outlined for the near future, they have sufficient finances to protect the interests of the Government without resort to possible supplemental requests.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, may I make these observations in support of Mr. TEAGUE's amendment to restore the \$5 million cut from appropriation for "Construction of Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities." As H.R. 7445 at page 37 very clearly points out, the purpose is "for hospital and domiciliary facilities, planning and major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending

any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration."

This action by the Appropriations Committee is most unwise for the reason that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been working for several years to develop a long-range program for the modernization of VA hospital facilities. A 12-year program was proposed by both the former Administration and approved for continuation by the new administration and this \$75 million recommended in the budget is but the second installment in the long-range program. All this amendment does is to restore an item so that the long-range modernization and repair program can proceed as planned. This was commenced in the 86th Congress and should not be reduced by the 87th.

It has been my privilege as a member of the Hospital Subcommittee of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on several different occasions to make inspections of various veteran installations. When we use the expression "repairs" as set out in the bill, we mean just plain ordinary everyday maintenance. This means the replacing of window sills, much needed caulking, pointing-up exterior masonry walls, water proofing, repairs of roof and the expenditure of small sums which can greatly increase the useful life of existing facilities. To save \$5 million here could cost many millions if this maintenance is not performed, when it is first needed and before conditions worsen.

The number of our veterans who are requiring hospitalization is steadily increasing and at the same time our existing hospitals are getting older and there is a growing need for repair. The continuation of this 12-year program is of vital importance. It is most imperative that it continue without reduction.

May I point out to my colleagues, if we curtail this program by the reduction proposed by the committee, or to put it differently, if we fail to restore the \$5 million we are but taking the first step toward throwing away an orderly 12-year program which will lead to modernization in 21 VA hospitals and general improvements in 26 other VA hospitals together with funds for orderly maintenance throughout the entire VA hospital system.

The amendment to restore this cut is most deserving of your support.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of further requests for time, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$430,000: *Provided,*



That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January 9, 1953, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished Chairman of the subcommittee, whether he knows if any of the money under this item of "Investigation of U.S. Citizens for Employment by International Organizations" is being expended to hire tract psychiatrists to examine these people.

Mr. THOMAS. If there is, that information was not given to the committee. This money is supposed to be spent by two agencies, one, Mr. Hoover's agency, the FBI, making these security tests, and the other the routine examination made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GROSS. I offer this observation to and suggestion the gentleman, that next year he inquire into this subject, because we have psychiatrists already on the payroll of the Government of the United States who ought to be able to handle these examinations, rather than go out and hire them on a per diem or consultant fee basis.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sure that is not so in this particular instance.

Mr. GROSS. I am telling the gentleman they are doing it in other places in the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Perhaps, the gentleman is right, but I do not think that is the case here.

Mr. GROSS. They are doing it particularly with reference to the international organizations in other agencies of Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Customhouse, courthouse, and Federal office building, New York, New York, \$59,222,-050;

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out page 481 of the hearings to comment on the translation of Russian scientific material by the National Science Foundation. I have been a longtime member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, and I previously was a member of the Special or Select Committee on Space appointed by the

Speaker to set up the science and space programs and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency legislation.

We, in America, are making good progress in research and development both at home and in space. But, we are working on many programs that other nations likewise are working on, and on some programs we have spent quite a bit of money and found out later some other researcher abroad had already been working or completed research on the same subject. I would like to point out specifically to the House how little we are doing in keeping up with what the Russians are doing in their research and development on scientific programs both on land, sea, air and in space. On page 481 of the hearings, there is the heading "Translation of Russian Material" and there is the following:

Mr. BOLAND. Now, how much more does the Foundation—

That is the National Science Foundation and Dr. Waterman is the head of it—

spend in this field for just translating Russian material?

Dr. WATERMAN. We translate about 45 periodicals. What would that figure be?

Dr. ADKINSON. Close to \$1 million.

Mr. BOLAND. So, the total would be \$1.8 million that you actually spend for just the translation of Russian material?

I might add that the \$800,000 is used in the State of Israel to have their people who are refugees and new citizens do the translating for us. I understand a lot of the translation is done in the field of Katchalski, who is considered to be one of the world's outstanding men in the area of biochemistry and particular biochemistry of proteins. If we, as a leader of the world in scientific research and development, are simply going to see what the other leader does or has accomplished in science and research at the rate of translating 45 periodicals in 1 year through the National Science Foundation, we in the United States ought to have our heads examined. This would be a treasure trove of scientific development and a real scientific exchange would be of benefit to both our peoples and world progress. I must say about the Russian scientists that they do a good job in many fields of science and research, and their monographs and research articles are generally scholarly, adequate, and produced for the purpose of scientific research. There is very little on the scientific level that is colored by political comment by scientists of any nation in this scientific and research literature. In the committee we have found those who have been working on many of these Russian publications find when they speak of their research and the results of their experiments they are reliable. Under these circumstances, we have such a resource, the science and research of many countries, open to us. In order to use the research and development progress that is available to us simply for the translating without our having to set up the laboratories and devote our scientists to such problems, we certainly should be making a bigger dent on the translating field through the National Science Foundation.

I have spoken before saying that we are getting over 85,000 documents a year from Russia for translation in exchange through the Library of Congress. I therefore recommend that the National Science Foundation and the Appropriations Committee use these foreign currencies that the U.S. Government has in the U.S. Treasury, which funds are not being put to any use whatever, in many cases. Likewise we should start a new system of appropriating in Congress, so the U.S. agencies such as the National Science Foundation need not buy these foreign currencies for dollars—our U.S. agencies such as the National Science Foundation simply do not use them; for example, in the current fiscal year the National Science Foundation had available \$2 million in foreign currencies, but under the rule that the National Science Foundation has to buy them in dollars they have used only about \$609,000 worth. I feel that this is an asset going to waste in the U.S. Treasury, and we should modernize our appropriations procedure. Let us appropriate in kind these foreign currencies in the U.S. Treasury owned by the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959, 1960 and 1961, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, \$25,000,-000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 19 beginning with line 9 and running through line 16, reading as follows:

#### SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959, 1960 and 1961, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, \$25,000,-000, to remain available until expended.

I base the point of order on the ground that the appropriation herein called for is not justified, is not authorized; and I respectfully call the attention of the Chair to the language in the report on page 10 under the title "Sites and expenses, public buildings projects."

This amount is needed for financing the site and expense costs of projects that are now pending or will be submitted to the Public Works Committees this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is good; it has not been authorized. But is it needed. They testified to that effect. It has not been authorized, however, and on that basis it is subject to a point of order.



The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOLLING). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the National Science Foundation, since the general authorizing legislation in 1955 or 1956 there has not been any need for an authorizing act being passed so that the National Science Foundation as a U.S. agency comes before any legislative or authorizing committee for its annual budget. The National Science Foundation simply goes before the House Appropriations Committee for action. Is that not the case, might I ask the committee?

Mr. JONAS. That is the case.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. FULTON. I have said that since the act was passed in 1955 or 1956 the National Science Foundation in getting its funds does not have to go before any legislative or authorizing committee of the Congress for authorizations. It simply goes before the House Committee on Appropriations without getting an annual authorization. Is that not correct?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right, yes. He is very seldom wrong, and he is not wrong now. But that is a matter for the Legislative Committee to handle; not us. The original act of the National Science Foundation is as broad as the world. I do not know how they can use any more legislative authority than they already have.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment on that? The House Science and Astronautics Committee has been given jurisdiction of the National Science Foundation, but we find that the officers of that agency, because of the authorizing act setting up the National Science Foundation, do not have to come before any legislative committee of the House to get an authorization. It is an entirely unusual situation, and it is one of the few agencies of the U.S. Government that can do just that thing, and bypass the legislative committee that has jurisdiction of the particular agency's programs.

My recommendation is that we on the House Science and Astronautics Committee make specific provision that authorization annually must be obtained by the National Science Foundation so that the programs can be justified.

I have been looking over the National Science Foundation programs that are set up currently. I have looked over their grants as well, and I think it would be good to have the authorizing legislative committee check to see that agency programs into the general program of research, development, exploration and science for the whole National Government. So I am going to recommend that, if there is no objection by the House Committee on Appropriations now present.

Mr. THOMAS. We will give whatever recommendation the gentleman makes very, very careful consideration.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING  
NUMBERED 7, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct Federal Office Building Numbered 7 in Washington, District of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch, in accordance with plans and specifications provided for in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1959 and 1961 (72 Stat. 1067 and 74 Stat. 432), \$23,700,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN of California: Page 20, line 5, strike the figure "\$23,700,000" and replace it with the figure "\$24,927,000."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply put in this bill an item that was recommended by the administration, recommended by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, recommended by the General Services Administration and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the construction of a fallout shelter in the new Executive Agency Building that is going to be built next to Lafayette Square.

This item was stricken out of the bill by the Appropriations Committee when this bill was before that committee. It was part of a series of items totaling about \$8 million stricken out by the committee for the construction of fallout shelters. I am offering the amendment to restore an item of \$1,227,000 for this one building, ready for construction, the Executive Office Building next to Lafayette Square.

I would like to read briefly from page 980 of the hearings, and this is a quote from the Office of General Services Administration:

The building will be multistoried; will provide a gross area of about 838,000 square feet and net assignable area of about 540,000 square feet; parking space for approximately 300 cars; a pedestrian tunnel to the Executive Office Building; and fallout protection for 11,600 persons in accordance with OCDM directive issued in August 1960.

I would like to read from page 850 of the hearings in which Mr. Ellis said the following in favor of these fallout shelters:

Sir, it is my judgment that the reason today there has not been a development of fallout shelters all over the United States in tremendous quantities is because there has been a complete failure of Federal example.

We here in Congress have been authorizing legislation for a number of years dealing with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. We have authorized legislation to match funds on the local basis all over the United States to stimulate construction; yet every time a proposal comes up in a bill for construction of fallout shelters in Federal buildings we strike that out.

There is no question that considerable protection can be provided by such shelters, so how can we expect the citizens of this country to do anything to protect themselves when we ourselves,

given in the budget funds for this purpose, requested by the administration, by the President, by the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization, by the Bureau of the Budget, by the General Services Administration, strike these sums out?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As a matter of fact, this is on a point which the President himself, in an unusual and extraordinary message to the Congress, stressed the urgency of the situation. I join the gentleman in urging the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am offering just one amendment for one building. If there is any place where it is needed, it is in the building adjoining the White House. It seems to me that we should deal with realities, and we should get a building constructed which has every fallout protection so that the people of the United States cannot point to us and say if we are not any more interested in the preservation of these United States, then why should they be interested?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and this paragraph end in 5 minutes, with the last 3 minutes reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I respect our friend from California. He is a very active and valuable Member of this body. As a matter of fact, we have had the privilege and the honor of receiving him and having him advise us in the subcommittee on several occasions. As I remarked one time before the subcommittee, if I ever get into trouble, I will call him as my lawyer. He is a very persuasive advocate.

But, Mr. Chairman, what he seeks to do here is add \$1.2 million for a \$24 million building, using round figures, in the District of Columbia. In my humble judgment, it is \$1.2 million thrown away, and I doubt whether anybody can dispute that statement here. Talk about protecting 11,000 people in that one building 8 or 9 stories high. It cannot be any higher than that on account of the rules and regulations in the District of Columbia. The whole building will not hold 11,000 people. How are you going to get 11,000 people on 8 floors down in the basement? All it does is simply add a few more toilet facilities and maybe make the walls 3 or 4 inches thicker. The General Services Administration did not ask for that. They are the construction experts of your Government. They did not ask for it. No; the OCDM has an ear in the White House. They asked for it, not the construction department. Do not make any



mistake about that. Get them on the phone, and they will tell you they were told to ask for it. It is not going to afford any protection. Is it for blast? Why, of course not. Nobody will tell you that this kind of extra construction work is going to be any protection should a bomb blast occur. No one contends that. Do we know where the bomb is going to fall? Do we know which way the wind is going to be blowing when it does fall? If it falls in the opposite direction, this building will not do any good. Suppose it is at nighttime. Where are these Federal employees going to be? They are not going to be in that building. After all, the Federal Government is not putting this in buildings in your town or my town. Why is it so important here? It is not going to do any good; it is just wasting money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield. If this amendment is adopted, the door is going to be kicked wide open to others, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The amendment was rejected.  
The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, \$14,000,000.

[Mr. BELL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, apropos of the colloquy between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Pennsylvania concerning solid fuel, I should like to have the RECORD show the following statement made by Mr. Webb in response to questions submitted to him concerning the testimony of Dr. Brunetti before the Brooks committee.

This paragraph begins on page 1088, volume 2 of the hearings. I would like to read this into the RECORD, so that the RECORD will show what Mr. Webb said:

Mr. WEBB. I think your concern for moving as rapidly as Dr. Brunetti indicates he would like to move will be answered in large part by the additional recommendations which will be made by President Kennedy shortly, and which will include the best judgment of the best minds we have in the Defense Department, in the NASA, the best judgment of a booster panel convened by Dr. Wiesner, scientific adviser to the President, indeed, all of those concerned with making the most rapid progress in our space effort.

I think you will find that many of the recommendations made by Dr. Brunetti will be incorporated in one form or another in this national space effort, but I do not believe a concentrated one-shot type of effort aimed at any specific year, such as 1965, will be recommended by the President.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. FULTON. On page 1082 where Mr. Webb said with reference to solid fuel—"I think we had \$100 million in

1961." He was wrong. It was \$3,100,000. Then when Mr. Dryden on page 1089, the Deputy Director of NASA said that the committee added an additional \$15 million—we did not. We added \$10 million because the Kennedy administration had upped the \$3.1 million figure for solid fuels to \$8.1 million and it made the total then \$18.1 million. There was an amendment for \$50 million additional before our Science and Astronautics Committee which was defeated. So the present total is \$18.1 million for solid fuels. I just want to make sure that with reference to these big boosters, we are not cutting them out by this bill—that is all I want to do.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure there is no intention on the part of the subcommittee to cut that and, in fact, we believe that research should go forward on solid as well as liquid propellants.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman and I compliment him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.  
The Clerk read as follows:

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$300,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I tried to get some information from the hearings with respect to the allowances and office facilities for former Presidents. I find that the committee gave the subject the once over very lightly. There are only a few words of question and answer testimony printed in the hearings on this matter. Then the committee went off the record and, of course, I cannot tell what happens off the record. Will the gentleman tell me about the increase in this appropriation, and how we are getting along with this retirement fund for former Presidents? I will say at the outset that I opposed the authorizing legislation, as the gentleman probably knows.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Let me say, for 1961 you had \$250,000. This year you have \$300,000 for the simple reason that our distinguished former President, General Eisenhower, has only been retired for 6 months. So it will go up next year for the full year basis by \$50,000. Here is the way the money goes. Each one of the three former Presidents get \$25,000 salary. You have two living widows who get \$10,000 each.

Mr. GROSS. That amounts to \$95,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you have \$50,000 for each of the Presidents for staff salaries. You have \$30,000 for office space. That is an open end proposition. There is no limit under the law as to what they can spend for office space but I do not think a distinguished ex-President is going to violate that kind of arrangement. There is the office rent for three of them and this year it amounts to

\$30,000. The act was clarified some 30 to 60 days ago right here on the floor of the House and the General Accounting Office accepted the explanations. Heretofore they have not been paid for telephone calls and Western Union service and so forth. Now they are. So in all probability, it will come in amounting to about \$13,300. That is the way the \$300,000 is made up. Those are the details.

Mr. GROSS. So we are providing them with or will be providing them this year with all of the good things of life although they made no contribution to this retirement; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Except an automobile—that is right.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Does former President Eisenhower, have a military or civilian staff?

Mr. THOMAS. I understand under the law he has no military advantages other than perhaps medicine; therefore the staff in his office is completely civilian and comes out of this appropriation. If he has military their salary costs would be deducted from this allowance.

Mr. GROSS. I notice there was a fire in his Gettysburg office the other day. That fire was in the son's office. Does the gentleman know if that office is a part of the staffing expense?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot answer that question. I am not trying to evade, but I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. I understand. One other question: You are having an awful time killing off the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, that is a collection business. That is all it is doing.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that next year we might write it off so that the taxpayers will not have to carry this thing any further after all these years?

Mr. THOMAS. We do not want to write it off because the money they are collecting runs into the millions. Some of those notes will run for 10 or 15 years yet.

Mr. GROSS. Is not this liquidation process down about the size where some agency of the Government could take it over and absorb the administrative costs, take over further liquidation of the assets?

Mr. THOMAS. What the gentleman is suggesting is that the General Services Administration might absorb the cost.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is it.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a good suggestion. We might be able to work it out. There are still assets to collect.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION  
Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the employment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and purchase of not to exceed forty-two passenger motor vehicles of which thirty-six shall be for replacement only; \$21,950,000, of which not less than \$1,696,700 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out



railroad safety activities and not less than \$1,129,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN, of Michigan: Page 29, line 19, after the colon strike out the balance of that line and lines 20, 21, and 22.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offered primarily perhaps to get a little information. Will the chairman of the subcommittee please answer who are these State commissioners? And what do they do? "Transportation requests for traveling in connection with their duties." Just what requests does that include and for what purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. In the gentleman's State and in my State and others there are no utility-regulating agencies. In our State we call it the railroad commission. They have jurisdiction over the railroads. Suppose the Interstate Commerce Commission asked the railroad commissioners to come to Washington or work on some matter. They are traveling on official public business.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but where do they go, and why?

Mr. THOMAS. Suppose the Interstate Commerce Commission, interested in the regulation of railroads, wanted them to come here for a conference.

If they ride on the railroad, and if they made that request, they would be entitled to transportation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The railroads would carry them without charge?

No answer? Does the Federal Government pay for that?

Again no answer?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean because I yielded to him he may yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. It has become customary here, and I only make this, because having served under Speaker Byrnes, a man of great ability and dignity who said there was a rule in effect that Members had to address the Chair or the Speaker before making a request that the Member speaking could yield to anyone? Is that right?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOLLING). That is the rule and practice of the House and Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pardon me, then. I had not noticed that the practice was being observed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. HOFFMAN, I do not think there is anything wrong in this request.

Mr. HARRIS. Now I am going to make a point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any more to the gentleman from Arkansas. I want to address the gentleman from Texas. If he assures me this is all right I will be happy to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. The previous point of order has neither been ruled on nor withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will answer the question. The Chair made a statement with regard to the rules and practice. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], has the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order. The gentleman is using the term "Arkansas" when it is "Arkansas."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman permit me to apologize. Ever since that little incident down there at Little Rock where troops were sent in, I have been somewhat in doubt as to the status of the city of the State if outsiders would stay that way the people in our cities and States would get along all right.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say in my humble judgment there is nothing wrong with this. Suppose the Interstate Commerce Commission asks the people of the gentleman's great State to come here or work on a problem in interstate commerce, it gives the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to pay their railroad fare, that is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see the record left as it is regarding this item. This is an important item, and one necessary through tradition, as the gentleman, the very able, learned and distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, has indicated, to bring the State commissioners to Washington to confer with the Interstate Commerce Commission. However, under the law, the Interstate Commerce Act, there is a procedure where in the case of an extension of service or an application for common carrier service in a given area, where two or more States are involved, members of the State commission are selected to meet and go into the application for extension of service into those

areas. The three-State board, as the case maybe, make their recommendations which come to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the Commission's advice, counsel and consideration.

The items here involved, as I understand it, and I am sure I am correct, are to take care of the necessary expenses of the State commissions when they are appropriately appointed as boards on an application of this kind involving 2 or more States in the area. That is what this item is for, and it is very important that it be retained.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for his very fine explanation. He is certainly one of the learned Members of this House on this subject.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, since this question of transportation came up I want to take the time to report that the Federal Government pays out some \$2.26 billion a year on transportation. There might be some question whether the Federal Government is in the transportation business. This should settle that point because \$2.26 billion is a very substantial amount of tickets for Uncle Sam to pay for.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand this is the pass business and that the Government pays for the passes, or what is the situation?

Mr. JONAS. My comment was not addressed to that subject.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee: Are we going back to the old days of the railroads where the railroads issued passes to politicians and others?

Mr. THOMAS. No. They do not get a railroad pass. This is a Government travel order, and the Interstate Commerce Commission pays it.

Mr. GROSS. So it is paid for by the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I want to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services: as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed \$62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and \$19,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; \$33,670,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interests of national defense.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the title "Selective Service" causes me to ask the gentle-



man from Texas if there is any money in any way in this bill for the so-called Peace Corps?

Mr. THOMAS. Not a dime; not a penny.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, \$70,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for technical services for replacement of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tennessee, is reduced from "\$1,500,000" to "\$921,600".

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: On page 37, lines 17 and 18, strike out "\$70,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000,000".

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in this country we have 171 VA hospitals with an investment of about \$2 billion. Back in 1947 the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs began trying to replace the old hospitals, which were girls' schools, hotels, old temporary installations that were built during World War II and others that were over 70 years old. Every year something happens so that this money is denied. In 1950 Korea came along and they said we cannot afford it. Sputnik came along and they said we cannot afford it. Finally, in the last administration, under President Eisenhower, we were able to reach an agreement that a minimum of \$900 million was needed to put our hospital program in shape. The Bureau of the Budget and the administration agreed that they would recommend \$75 million each year for 12 years. Now, this was a minimum amount they thought we had to use to put this hospital plan in shape.

Now, the Bureau of the Budget this year recommended \$75 million. The administration agreed to \$75 million. After this amount was agreed upon and placed in the budget, the President announced a policy of fallout shelters, so the Veterans' Administration of necessity said that they would use some of this money for fallout shelters.

If you read the report on page 17 under "Construction of Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities," which report shows that they cut \$5 million, the last sentence reads:

Funds requested for the incorporation of fallout shelters in projects have been deleted.

Well, I am sure the Veterans' Administration will not use a penny of this money for fallout shelters if this Congress indicates they do not want them

to. This \$75 million was a budget item under our construction program for veterans hospitals.

For the benefit of the Members, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has done a lot of work on hospitals, and if you want to know something about hospitals, there are two documents to tell you every detail in every hospital in the United States. We know exactly what the situation is. And, I think I speak for every member of the committee when I say it is necessary to put this \$75 million in the bill, and this is the amount of money which is necessary.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the position of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This hospital program has been very carefully studied throughout a long period of time. We feel that the figure of \$75 million is the minimum necessary for this year. I urge the House to agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. This figure of \$900 million referred to by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was arrived at because this very subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations came in and criticized the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Veterans' Administration for not having a definite program. It was as a result of the action of this subcommittee that the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and all persons interested agreed to this 12-year program.

Last year there was an effort to cut this appropriation by about \$35 million, and the Congress said they would not go along with that. This year they have tried to cut it by \$5 million. Certainly if these hospitals are to be kept up and the Veterans' Administration is to provide for the veterans of this country the service they must have it is an absolute necessity that the Veterans' Administration have for this year and for the next 10 years \$75 million a year for this construction program. I certainly urge that this program be approved and that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I join with my chairman, my colleague from Pennsylvania, and my colleague from Indiana, on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. If we are to have a planned program, not just a feast-or-famine program, but one where we can do justice to the veterans, we should cross party lines and go ahead with this program. I agree that we should have the \$75 million a year for this program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would restore to the Veterans' Administration appropriation the \$5 million cut by the committee

from the appropriation for the construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.

I am surprised at this action by the Appropriations Committee since that committee participated in developing the long-range modernization, replacement and repair program under which the Veterans' Administration is operated. In 1956 the report of the committee, No. 304, which accompanied H.R. 5240, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1956, contained the following statement:

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: The committee considered a budget estimate of \$13,815,000 for this item and has increased this amount to \$30 million. During hearings the administrator testified that the Veterans' Administration was currently making a survey of the hospital facilities to determine what hospitals should be replaced and which hospitals need extensive modernization. The results of the surveys are already startling. The Veterans' Administration is ready to move now and requested \$20 million of the Bureau of the Budget this year for the program, which was denied. The committee is of the opinion there is no need for delaying this program because a great amount of work will have to be done. The whole purpose of the modernization of older hospitals is to bring the present plant up to date instead of building new and additional hospitals. Much money can be saved by modernizing rather than having a new hospital construction program.

The committee again commented in its report, No. 1543, which accompanied H.R. 11574, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959, as follows:

The committee cannot understand why it is taking so long to make any progress with the hospital renovation program. It certainly has not been due to lack of funds. The unobligated balance of construction funds at the present time is \$144 million. It will be \$105 million at the beginning of fiscal year 1959. The committee will expect an increased number of projects to proceed into construction without delay and will review the situation further next year.

House Report No. 350 by the Appropriations Committee, which accompanied H.R. 7040, the independent offices appropriation bill of 1960, made the following statement:

The committee for several years has urged the Veterans' Administration to accelerate its modernization and replacement program and the increase approved in the bill will enable the Veterans' Administration to move significantly ahead.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have given this matter their attention and conducted exhaustive surveys. As a result of this work, the President approved a 12-year modernization program at a cost which will ultimately exceed \$900 million. The \$75 million recommended in the budget was the second installation on this long-range program. It was from this amount the Appropriations Committee has cut the \$5 million.

In 1959 the Veterans' Administration completed a much needed study to determine the approximate cost of modernization and replacement of hospitals constructed prior to World War II to meet acceptable standards of modern medical care. This study established the urgent need for modernizing 72 hospitals and



replacing an additional 15 of the 171 hospitals in the Veterans' Administration system. The age of these hospitals ranges to over 70 years. The cost of restoring these facilities to an adequate physical and functional condition to meet minimum medical standards was estimated at \$900 million.

On the basis of this study a \$900 million 12-year program was approved by the President. His budget to Congress for fiscal year 1961 requested \$75 million for the first installment of the 12-year program. Congress appropriated these funds and the long-range modernization program was started. The Veterans' Administration has used the money appropriated in 1961 to begin construction of new hospitals at Martinez, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Washington, D.C. in addition to many modernization projects at other hospitals. This reflects real progress in the implementation of this program.

The President in his fiscal year 1962 budget has requested the second installment of \$75 million to proceed with this 12-year long-range plan. This request provides funds for the construction of a 1,264-bed replacement hospital at Wood, Wis., and a 500-bed new hospital at Charleston, S.C.; planning of a 580-bed new hospital at Atlanta, Ga.; and purchase of a site for a 960-bed hospital at Los Angeles, Calif. In addition, \$38.7 million has been requested for modernization projects at other stations.

The continuation of this \$75 million annual appropriation is basic in accomplishing the long-range modernization plan to provide adequate hospital facilities for the care of veterans throughout our country. For many years the level of the Veterans' Administration construction program has been subject to changes of economic conditions and the lack of a firm program plan. Each adjustment in the appropriation level results in a "checkerboard" adjustment of specific projects from one fiscal year to the next through subsequent fiscal year programs.

The acceptance of this 12-year long-range plan and the appropriation of the first \$75 million increment in fiscal year 1961 has established this program on a sound basis. Any reduction in the appropriation level below the President's request will again cause "checkerboard" adjustments and resultant slippages of programed projects throughout the 12-year program. The advantages inherent in the long-range plan to provide modern hospital facilities for our veterans will be lost.

In the fiscal year 1962 budget, \$876,000 was included to provide for fallout protection in all new construction in accordance with the President's policy, although funds were not included in the long-range plan for this purpose. The appropriation bill as reported would preclude the use of funds for fallout construction. This limitation on the use of funds for fallout construction, however, should have no effect on the Veterans' Administration's construction appropriation level as funds for this purpose were not included in the long-range plan and there are other projects in the

\$900 million program for which this money is needed.

The \$5 million reduction by the House Appropriations Committee from the "Construction of Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities" appropriation should be restored so that modernization of the VA hospital system can proceed according to the present long-range program without further delay.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

This appropriation provides for construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and becomes available for use after Presidential approval of individual projects or groups of projects. The facilities include new and replacement hospitals and domiciliaries, acquisition of sites, modernization of and other improvements at existing facilities—including regional offices and supply depots—and fixed and initial portable equipment.

This amount is the second increment of an orderly 12-year program for replacement and modernization of our existing hospital facilities for the following projects and programs:

Replacement: Charleston, S.C.; Wood, Wis.; Atlanta, Ga.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

Modernization: Battle Creek, Mich.; Coatesville, Pa.; Danville, Ill.; Des Moines, Iowa; Fort Harrison, Mont.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Knoxville, Iowa; Lake City, Fla.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Montrose, N.Y.; New Orleans, La.; Oteen, N.C.; Palo Alto, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; San Francisco, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; Sepulveda, Calif.; Togus, Maine; Tuskegee, Ala.; and White River Junction, Vt.

Other improvements program: Albany, N.Y.; Ann Arbor, Mich.; Baltimore, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; Brecksville, Ohio; Buffalo, N.Y.; Butler, Pa.; Canandaigua, N.Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Erie, Pa.; Hot Springs, S. Dak.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Iron Mountain, Mich.; Louisville, Ky.; Omaha, Nebr.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Saginaw, Mich.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Seattle, Wash.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Wilmington, Del.; and various stations.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see this appropriation in this bill and I hope the Teague amendment will be adopted increasing this appropriation to \$75 million.

A continued improvement in our veterans' hospital facilities is a constant necessity. This appropriation will make possible the construction of a new veterans' hospital at Charleston, S.C. This hospital will be built adjacent to the South Carolina State Medical College. It will be a tremendous boost to our veterans' program in South Carolina.

We have many veterans on the waiting list for hospitalization. South Carolina has less beds per capita than any State in the Union. We desperately need this hospital in Charleston and this bill will provide \$11,200,000 for its construction.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, in 1959 the Veterans' Administration completed a

much needed study to determine the approximate cost of modernization and replacement of hospitals constructed prior to World War II to meet acceptable standards of modern medical care. This survey established the urgent need for modernizing 72 hospitals and replacing an additional 15 of the 171 hospitals in the Veterans' Administration system. The age of these hospitals ranges to over 70 years. The cost of restoring these facilities to an adequate physical and functional condition to meet minimum medical standards was estimated at \$900 million.

On the basis of this study a \$900 million 12-year program was approved by the President. His budget to Congress for fiscal year 1961 requested \$75 million for the first installment of the 12-year program. Congress appropriated these funds and the long-range modernization program was started. The Veterans' Administration has used the money appropriated in 1961 to begin construction of new hospitals at Martinez, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Washington, D.C.; in addition to many modernization projects at other hospitals. This reflects real progress in the implementation of this program.

The President in his fiscal year 1962 budget has requested the second installment of \$75 million to proceed with this 12-year long-range plan. This request provides funds for the construction of a 1,264 bed replacement hospital at Wood, Wis., and a 500-bed new hospital at Charleston, S.C.; planning of a 580-bed new hospital at Atlanta, Ga.; and purchase of a site for a 960-bed hospital at Los Angeles, Calif. In addition, \$38.7 million has been requested for modernization projects at other stations.

The continuation of this \$75 million annual appropriation is basic in accomplishing the long-range modernization plan to provide adequate hospital facilities for the care of veterans throughout our country. For many years the level of the Veterans' Administration construction program has been subject to changes of economic conditions and the lack of a firm program plan. Each adjustment in the appropriation level results in a checkerboard adjustment of specific projects from one fiscal year to the next through subsequent fiscal year programs.

The acceptance of this 12-year long-range plan and the appropriation of the first \$75 million increment in fiscal year 1961 has established this program on a sound basis. Any reduction in the appropriation level below the President's request will again cause checkerboard adjustments and resultant slippages of programed projects throughout the 12-year program. The advantages inherent in the long-range plan to provide modern hospital facilities for our veterans will be lost.

The \$5 million reduction by the House Appropriations Committee from the "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities" appropriation should be restored so that modernization of the



VA hospital system can proceed according to the present long-range program without further delay.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment to restore \$5 million to the Veterans' Administration for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

I am uniquely familiar with the genesis of this program designed to bring the best possible planning techniques to the vast VA hospital construction mission, for I was the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs prior to my election to this body. The program was heartily endorsed by every veterans' organization.

It is significant to note that the proposal to phase out an estimated \$900 million VA construction program over 12 years, at the rate of \$75 million annually was discussed with, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, by President Eisenhower, and was, of course, supported in the budget request submitted by President Kennedy. So, in a real sense, this is a matter with total bipartisan and universal support, and the principle of this long-range program was approved by Congress last year.

I can assure you gentlemen that this long-range plan of the Veterans' Administration was designed to bring order and precise planning to the mammoth problem of maintaining and replacing the physical plants and equipment of the VA hospital system—the largest hospital system in the United States. It permits sound planning, and it has designed into it a flexibility to cope with the shifting veteran population and medical needs. This plan represents the dedicated effort and creative thinking of hospital construction experts in and out of Government, and it should not be impaired by curtailing the funds required to underwrite its successful installation. I speak in favor of this amendment from the strong personal conviction, based on my personal experience as a member of the VA staff, that the program requested by that agency is soundly conceived and will result in an orderly and effective and vital hospital modernization and replacement program.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I was a service officer of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars for many years, and have been very familiar with the hospital program of the Veterans' Administration. It is a very fine program. I know that the amount that is asked here, \$75 million, is a very minimum. It would be a grave mistake to

cut this amount, so I wholeheartedly join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] in support of this amendment.

[Mr. ROUDEBUSH addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I do not think this Congress ought to disrupt an orderly program here that we thought everybody understood. I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS].

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, we had in Atlanta before it was abolished a hospital with accommodations for 650 veteran patients. That was eliminated on the promise that we would have established a new 500-bed hospital. It has never been established. The entire area of north Georgia has now only a facility with 300 beds. We are sorely in need of this 500-bed hospital which was promised to us before this 650-bed hospital was abolished. It was promised to us. We need it. We should have it. I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, and sincerely hope it will be adopted. Our situation in north Georgia is tragic as far as the veterans are concerned. The 300-bed hospital is greatly overcrowded, and is utterly inadequate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I do a little bragging on this subcommittee. We started the ball rolling on this modernization and rebuilding program some 7 or 8 years ago. A lot of years when it was dragging its feet we went \$12 or \$15 million over the budget. So we are in the forefront pushing it. We are not trying to hurt it.

Let us see what the facts are. I hope my colleagues will listen to me carefully. We are going to give you the facts. This is not going to hurt this program one bit. There are 58 projects involved in this. Some are for technical services and others are \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000 or more for construction. There are construction funds for new replacement hospitals at Charleston, S.C., \$11,200,000, and Wood, Wis., \$26,600,000. These are complete replacements along with 56 others. There is not one single contractor's estimate in this whole budget of \$70 or \$75 million. Let me repeat that. There is not one single firm estimate, not one. Who made these estimates? The bureau made them. Have you ever heard of one of the bureaus cutting themselves out of a job? In the General Services Administration for the last 5 years—we have taken Mr. Floete's own estimates and reduced them 5 percent, 6 percent, 7 percent and 8 percent and then when we got through, he would turn around and reduce with his own staff another 7 percent. They would go ahead

and build good, fine buildings. And they are going to build good, fine buildings now. Let me go one step further—but think about that, there is not one single contractor's estimate. The estimate was made here in the bureau. Do you think any of them are going to underestimate it? If that is the case, they have never done it so far.

The committee has adopted a policy and I know you agree with it because you have approved it year after year—we say to the Veterans' Administration—Give us your estimates for a complete project. We want to give you all the money you need but do not start a project until you have the money to complete it.

We think it is good, wise economy and it is going to save everybody money. It will save you money.

On that basis, how much money do they have now that they are not going to spend during fiscal year 1961 that is going to be available for next year in addition to the \$70 million in this bill? You notice that nobody told you that. All they have in addition to the \$70 million in this bill unobligated and unspent is \$49,900,000. So they have \$129 million. You ask us what we did with the cut of \$5 million out of the \$125 million in the kitty. We took out less than \$1 million for the shelters as we have in every bill, and that would not amount to a hill of beans. Take a 1,000-bed hospital that is five, six, or seven stories high and add a shelter in the basement. How many of those bed patients could ever get in a wheelchair and get to the shelter? In a 500-bed hospital there are about about 700 or 800 employees. At any given time, and in an emergency there are not enough employees and not enough elevators to ever get them to the shelter downstairs in the basement. Let us be frank about it. Otherwise, this is a general cut. They have \$120 million with this \$70 million, and they said \$42 million of this \$70 million will be unobligated next year.

We want them to build these hospitals, good, strong hospital buildings that will last for 50 or 60 or 70 years. This \$70 million will do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote and I hope the amendment is voted down because they do not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California, [Mr. BELL], may extend his remarks following those of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and Mr. ALBERT, Speaker pro tempore, having assumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter if they so desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### SHIPMENT OF CUBAN TOMATOES INTO THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. WILSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote the President to check the accuracy of a report which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, concerning shipment of tons of Cuban tomatoes into the United States.

These tomatoes are shipped in from Cuba, then crated in the United States so that our people will not know where they are produced. They are flooding the American markets. They are allowed to come into this Nation under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, better known as GATT. This is an international agency which allows the State Department to regulate our foreign commerce in concert with other nations and often against our own best interests.

Mr. Speaker, in public life I suppose one should develop a tolerance for the idea of having tomatoes thrown in your direction—but I have no intention of standing idly by while a Communist dictator throws these blood-stained tomatoes onto the American market.

On May 17, I asked the White House about this trade with Cuba. In my letter, I reminded the President that on March 10 I had telegraphed him to ask that all imports from Cuba be eliminated. I questioned the accuracy of the report on tomatoes and suggested that if it were true, if we are still importing tomatoes and other goods, that the President halt such imports with an Executive order.

On June 2, I received the following reply from Myer Feldman, Deputy Special Counsel to the President:

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: The President has asked me to reply to your May 18 letter requesting comment on the accuracy of reports that the United States is permitting the import of Cuban-grown tomatoes and suggesting promulgation of an Executive order to prohibit such imports if confirmed.

I have checked this matter with the Department of State and learn that the report is true. Sugar is the only commodity now prohibited entry into the United States.

The Department of State and other interested agencies are now actively considering what further measures, consistent with our international obligations, should be taken to deal with the problem of Cuban trade.

We very much appreciate being advised of your views concerning this matter.

MYER FELDMAN,

Deputy Special Counsel to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this letter does nothing but point up the dilatory approach to the Cuban trade problem which has characterized the present administration. Last year, President Eisenhower shut off all exports, except food and drugs, to Cuba and halted the importation of all sugar from that country. This reduced Cuban import volume, which in pre-Castro 1958 had been running at a rate of \$528 million per year, to a total of 16.7 million during the last quarter of 1960. Since that time, although the present administration has twice advised me the matter is "being studied," no further action has been

taken and Cuban imports continue to flow into this country.

During the first quarter of this year the Department of Commerce reports that Cuban imports totaled \$12 million, which means that American funds are still flowing into Castro's pockets. If this trade were not valuable to Cuba, I am sure that Castro would have ended it long ago.

In his letter, Mr. Feldman says the administration is weighing what further measures can be taken "consistent with our international obligations" to deal with the Cuban situation.

I say the President has the present clear authority under section 5B of the Trading With the Enemy Act to halt the importation of Cuban goods. In today's Washington Post, there is an article which indicates that trade has been reduced considerably through the patriotic actions of several American groups and many individuals in refusing to trade with Castro.

However, as the White House admits, Cuban tomatoes, avocados, other fruits, cigars, or any product except sugar, can flow freely into this country. Even if this trade has been considerably reduced, I believe that in order to be "consistent with our own domestic obligations" our Chief Executive should use the powers at his disposal to cut off from Cuba any source of U.S.-generated income through trade channels. I sincerely hope he will act at once to do so.

#### THE LATE THOMAS E. MURRAY

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the death on May 26, 1961, of Thomas Edward Murray, America lost a man and a citizen of outstanding qualities and achievements. He was one of God's noblemen. Mr. Murray was well known to the country and to the world through his performance as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1950 to 1957, and had since served his country with distinction, both as a consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and as a public speaker of vigor and logical persuasiveness. His voice was heard in effective advocacy of the cause of international peace and the rule of law, of international control of atomic energy, of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and of the application of atomic military power to limited war, and to the prevention of limited war, through the stockpiling of quantities of smaller atomic weapons. Whatever may be thought of the particular courses Mr. Murray advocated for our country in these matters, it is certain that he did us all a great service in contributing to the discussion of these vital matters an alert mind, rich in learning and experience; a courageous heart, gifted with honesty, vigor, and an outspoken eloquence; and a soul devoted to the unselfish pursuit of the good of all men. And we are now coming around to his way of thinking—years late—but the quicker we do, the better for our country and the free world.







87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 7445

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 8, 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4      in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry in-  
5      dependent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpo-  
6      rations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June  
7      30, 1962, namely:



1

## TITLE I

2

## EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

4

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem, \$320,000.

13

## OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

14

## MOBILIZATION

15

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense and defense mobilization functions; not to exceed \$3,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and

25

1 conclusive; and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of  
2 travel; \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount  
3 shall be available for not to exceed 303 positions in the Dis-  
4 trict of Columbia area: *Provided further*, That contracts for  
5 not to exceed two persons under this appropriation for  
6 temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section  
7 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be  
8 renewed annually, and one such contract, for the services of  
9 an expert or consultant for telecommunications, may provide  
10 for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75.

11 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS  
12 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

13 For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies  
14 to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization func-  
15 tions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense  
16 Mobilization, including payments by the Department of  
17 Labor to State employment security agencies for the full  
18 cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization ac-  
19 tivities, \$6,567,000.

20 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

21 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense  
22 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,  
23 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds, \$22,-  
24 000,000, of which not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be avail-



1 able for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of  
2 said Act.

3                   EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

4       For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,  
5 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense  
6 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of  
7 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,  
8 \$21,600,000.

9                   RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

10       For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
11 studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil  
12 defense and defense mobilization, including evacuation, shel-  
13 ter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by  
14 section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,  
15 as amended, and other law, including services as authorized  
16 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ,  
17 \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

18                   CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

19       For expenses necessary for the design, construction, and  
20 equipment of protected regional facilities for the Office of  
21 Civil and Defense Mobilization, \$2,500,000, to remain avail-  
22 able until expended.

23                   GENERAL PROVISION

24       No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-  
25 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of  
26 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed

1 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense  
2 Mobilization.

### 3 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

#### 4 DISASTER RELIEF

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
6 Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-  
7 1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local govern-  
8 ments in major disasters, \$6,000,000, to remain available  
9 until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum  
10 of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative  
11 expenses.

### 12 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

#### 13 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

##### 14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,  
16 including employment of temporary guards on a contract  
17 or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of air-  
18 craft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as  
19 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
20 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100  
21 per diem; \$8,900,000.

#### 22 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT

##### 23 AUTHORIZATION)

24 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-  
25 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board



1 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49  
2 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$74,800,000, of  
3 which not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for subsidy  
4 for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, to  
5 remain available until expended.

## 6 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

### 7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary expenses, including services as authorized  
9 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C.  
10 55a) ; not to exceed \$10,000 for medical examinations per-  
11 formed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; pay-  
12 ment in advance for library membership in societies whose  
13 publications are available to members only or to members  
14 at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed  
15 \$83,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Com-  
16 mission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reim-  
17 bursement of the General Services Administration for  
18 security guard services for protection of confidential files;  
19 and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial services by contract,  
20 without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as  
21 amended; \$21,029,000: *Provided*, That no part of this ap-  
22 propriation shall be available for the Career Executive  
23 Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4,  
24 1958, as amended.

25 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil

1 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and  
2 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and  
3 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established  
4 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

5 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR  
6 EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

7 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Ex-  
8 ecutive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,  
9 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary  
10 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of  
11 other international organizations, certain information con-  
12 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered  
13 for employment by such organizations, including services  
14 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
15 U.S.C. 55a), \$430,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation  
16 shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the  
17 applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Com-  
18 mission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses  
19 incurred by such agencies under said Executive order:  
20 *Provided further*, That members of the International Organ-  
21 izations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual trans-  
22 portation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence au-  
23 thorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,  
24 while traveling on official business away from their homes  
25 or regular places of business, including periods while en



1 route to and from and at the place where their services are  
 2 to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections  
 3 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section  
 4 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed  
 5 to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time  
 6 or intermittent service as a member of the International Or-  
 7 ganizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service  
 8 Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated  
 9 January 9, 1953, as amended.

#### 10 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

11 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May  
 12 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of  
 13 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),  
 14 \$2,248,000.

#### 15 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

#### 16 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

17 For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund"  
 18 of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as  
 19 authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health  
 20 Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$4,500,000, to remain avail-  
 21 able until expended.

#### 22 GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION, RETIRED EMPLOYEES

#### 23 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

24 For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits  
 25 fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired

1 employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal  
2 Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850),  
3 \$19,000,000.

4 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND  
5 DISABILITY FUND

6 For financing the annuity benefits and increases provided  
7 by the Act of June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$44,637,000,  
8 to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability  
9 fund: *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission shall in-  
10 clude annually, in its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget,  
11 estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the  
12 civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts  
13 paid out of the fund by reason of the enactment of Public  
14 Law 85-465, and the Bureau of the Budget shall submit an-  
15 nually to the Congress estimates of the appropriations neces-  
16 sary to reimburse the fund for such amounts.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES  
18 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

19 Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds in the "Em-  
20 ployees health benefits fund" shall be available for reim-  
21 bursement to the Civil Service Commission for administra-  
22 tive expenses incurred by the Commission during the current  
23 fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees



1 Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 713), including serv-  
2 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
3 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

4 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES

5 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

6 Not to exceed \$260,000 of the funds in the "Employees  
7 life insurance fund" shall be available for reimbursement to  
8 the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses  
9 incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year  
10 in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life  
11 Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103),  
12 including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act  
13 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a): *Provided*, That this  
14 limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10  
15 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of  
16 Public Law 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c)).

17 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

18 OPERATIONS

19 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,  
20 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses  
21 for research and development and for establishment of air  
22 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the  
23 Federal Airport Act; not to exceed \$10,000 for representa-  
24 tion allowances and for official entertainment; and purchase  
25 and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$428,000,000: *Provided*,  
26 That total costs of aviation medicine research for the Federal

1 Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appro-  
2 priation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed \$1,500,000  
3 or include in excess of 120 positions: *Provided further*, That  
4 there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received  
5 from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities,  
6 and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance  
7 and operation of air navigation facilities.

### 8 FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

9 For an additional amount for the acquisition, establish-  
10 ment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of  
11 air navigation and experimental facilities, including the ini-  
12 tial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the con-  
13 struction and furnishing of quarters and related accommoda-  
14 tions for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation  
15 Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommo-  
16 dations are not available (at a total cost of construction of  
17 not to exceed \$50,000 per housing unit in Alaska); and  
18 purchase of nine aircraft; \$120,000,000, to remain  
19 available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be cred-  
20 ited to this appropriation funds received from States, coun-  
21 ties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private  
22 sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air  
23 navigation facilities: *Provided further*, That no part of the  
24 foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construc-  
25 tion of a new wind tunnel.



1 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF  
2 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

3 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority  
4 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to  
5 enter into contracts, \$70,000,000, to remain available until  
6 expended.

## 7 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

8 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
9 research, development, and service testing in accordance  
10 with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C.  
11 1301-1542), including construction of experimental facilities  
12 and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$60,000,-  
13 000, to remain available until expended.

14 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON

## 15 NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms, and arms and ammunition, \$3,225,000.

20 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES

21 INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

22 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-  
23 nance, improvement and protection of the Dulles Interna-  
24 tional Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of  
25 uniforms, and arms and ammunition, \$1,975,000.

1        CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

2        For necessary expenses for construction at Washington  
3 National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,200,000,  
4 to remain available until expended.

5        CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, ADDITIONAL  
6                                  WASHINGTON AIRPORT

7        For an additional amount for "Construction and develop-  
8 ment, additional Washington airport", \$26,100,000, to re-  
9 main available until expended.

10        CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

11        For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
12 the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including  
13 advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section  
14 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529) ,  
15 \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

16                                  GENERAL PROVISION

17        During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations  
18 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the  
19 Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified  
20 in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C.  
21 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Ad-  
22 ministrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance  
23 and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles  
24 and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as au-



1   thorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5  
2   U.S.C. 2131).

### 3   FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

#### 4                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5   For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the  
6   Commission as authorized by law, including land and struc-  
7   tures (not to exceed \$48,000), special counsel fees, improve-  
8   ment and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to  
9   exceed \$15,600), services as authorized by section 15 of the  
10   Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of  
11   not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement  
12   only, \$12,400,000.

### 13   FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

#### 14                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15   For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,  
16   as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor  
17   vehicles and not to exceed \$558,000 for expenses of travel,  
18   \$8,793,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be avail-  
19   able for special counsel and services as authorized by section  
20   15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

### 21   FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

#### 22                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23   For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-  
24   sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized  
25   by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by

1 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
2 \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appro-  
3 priation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter  
4 provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds  
5 are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such  
6 resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

## 7 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

### 8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,  
10 including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries  
11 without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the  
12 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and services  
13 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
14 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$43,000,000.

## 15 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

### 16 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

17 For necessary expenses of real property management  
18 and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings  
19 in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;  
20 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)  
21 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of  
22 building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and dis-  
23 posal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests there-  
24 in; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of  
25 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); \$170,000,000: *Pro-*



1 *vided*, That this appropriation shall be available, without  
2 regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as  
3 amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or  
4 parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for  
5 “Emergency operating expenses”.

6 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

7 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to  
8 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pur-  
9 suant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479),  
10 including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves  
11 and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent  
12 thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for  
13 public buildings; preliminary planning of projects by con-  
14 tract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition,  
15 and equipment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until ex-  
16 pended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropria-  
17 tion, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings  
18 Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the  
19 Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C.  
20 901 et. seq.), and Public Health Service facilities (except  
21 Indian health facilities), shall be considered to be public  
22 buildings.

23 CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

24 For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise  
25 provided for, necessary to construct public buildings projects  
26 and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where

1 the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000  
2 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat.  
3 479), including equipment for such buildings, \$171,600,-  
4 000, and not to exceed \$500,000 of this amount shall be  
5 available to the Administrator for construction, sites and ex-  
6 penses for small public buildings outside the District of Co-  
7 lumbia as the Administrator approves and deems necessary,  
8 all to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the  
9 foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings  
10 projects at locations and at maximum construction improve-  
11 ment costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as fol-  
12 lows:

13 Post office and Federal office building, Decatur, Ala-  
14 bama, \$1,315,750;

15 Customhouse and Federal office building, Los Angeles,  
16 California, \$27,388,500;

17 Customs and appraisers warehouse, Long Beach area,  
18 California, \$2,000,000;

19 Courthouse and Federal office building, Denver, Colo-  
20 rado, \$18,145,000;

21 Post office and Federal office building, Statesboro,  
22 Georgia, \$538,650, which shall be known as the Prince  
23 H. Preston Building;

24 Post office and Federal office building, Winder, Georgia,  
25 \$475,000;



- 1 Post office and Federal office building (construction and  
2 alteration), Wyandotte, Michigan, \$402,800;
- 3 Post office and Federal office building, Santa Fe, New  
4 Mexico, \$2,362,650;
- 5 Customhouse, courthouse, and Federal office building,  
6 New York, New York, \$59,222,050;
- 7 Post office and courthouse, Bryson City, North Carolina,  
8 \$753,350;
- 9 Post office building, Thomasville, North Carolina, \$327,-  
10 750;
- 11 Border station, Pembina, North Dakota, \$183,350;
- 12 Federal office building, Cincinnati, Ohio, \$17,432,500;
- 13 Post office and Federal office building, Medford, Oregon,  
14 \$1,728,050;
- 15 Post office and Federal office building (construction and  
16 alteration), Johnstown, Pennsylvania, \$1,187,500;
- 17 Post office and Federal office building, Lebanon, Penn-  
18 sylvania, \$730,550;
- 19 Border station, Derby Line, Vermont, \$267,900;
- 20 Government Printing Office field plant, District of Co-  
21 lumbia, \$1,545,650: *Provided further*, That the maximum  
22 construction improvement costs heretofore approved for the  
23 following projects are hereby increased as follows:

1 Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of  
2 Columbia, is increased from "\$15,105,000" to "\$18,905,-  
3 000", including \$5,700,000 for laboratory and other equip-  
4 ment;

5 Courthouse and Federal office building, Chicago, Illi-  
6 nois, is increased from "\$5,500,000" to "\$36,793,000", in-  
7 cluding construction of the first of two buildings authorized  
8 at this location: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limits  
9 of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are ef-  
10 fected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum.

11 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

12 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any  
13 other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to  
14 the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40  
15 U.S.C. 356), \$5,200,000.

16 CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7,  
17 WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

18 For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise  
19 provided for, necessary to construct Federal Office Building  
20 Numbered 7 in Washington, District of Columbia, for use  
21 of agencies of the executive branch, in accordance with plans  
22 and specifications provided for in the Independent Offices



1 Appropriation Acts, 1959 and 1961 (72 Stat. 1067 and 74  
2 Stat. 432) , \$23,700,000, to remain available until expended.

3 • OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

4 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-  
5 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not  
6 otherwise provided for, \$3,450,000: *Provided*, That not  
7 to exceed \$3,935,000 of any funds received during the cur-  
8 rent or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204 (a)  
9 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of  
10 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law,  
11 shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and shall  
12 be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the func-  
13 tions of the General Services Administration under the said  
14 Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess  
15 and surplus personal property.

16 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

17 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for  
18 supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the  
19 stores depot system, and contractual services incident to re-  
20 ceiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items, \$27,-  
21 375,000.

22 GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

23 To increase the general supply fund established by the

1 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,  
2 as amended (5 U.S.C. 630g), \$4,000,000.

3 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND  
4 RECORDS SERVICE

5 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-  
6 ords management and related activities as provided by law,  
7 including reimbursement for security guard services, and con-  
8 tractual services incident to movement or disposal of records,  
9 \$14,000,000.

10 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC  
11 UTILITIES SERVICE

12 For necessary expenses of transportation and public utili-  
13 ties management and related activities, as provided by law,  
14 including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
15 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$75  
16 per diem for individuals, \$2,475,000.

17 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

18 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions  
19 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50  
20 U.S.C. 98-98h), during the current fiscal year, for trans-  
21 portation and handling, within the United States (including  
22 charges at United States ports), storage, security, and main-  
23 tenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or trans-



1   ferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to  
2   section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
3   Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b) ), for carrying  
4   out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of  
5   1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools and  
6   industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General  
7   Services Administration is responsible, including reimburse-  
8   ment for security guard services, services as authorized by  
9   section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
10   and not to exceed \$3,000,000 for operating expenses,  
11   \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of funds available shall  
12   be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage fa-  
13   cilities: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year  
14   the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire  
15   leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of  
16   twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of  
17   strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held  
18   pursuant to the aforesaid Acts provided said leasehold inter-  
19   ests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided*  
20   *further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be  
21   no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical  
22   materials which, in accordance with section 6 (a) of the  
23   Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C.  
24   98e (a) ), may be transferred without reimbursement to  
25   stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Pro-*

1 *vided further*, That any receipts from sales during the cur-  
 2 rent fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treas-  
 3 ury: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year  
 4 materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense  
 5 Production Act of 1950, as amended; shall be available,  
 6 without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value  
 7 to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, proc-  
 8 essing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to sec-  
 9 tion 3 (c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling  
 10 Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

#### 11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

12 For expenses of executive direction for activities under  
 13 the control of the General Services Administration, \$290,-  
 14 000.

#### 15 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER

#### 16 PRESIDENTS

17 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August  
 18 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$300,000: *Provided*, That the Ad-  
 19 ministrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary  
 20 of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out  
 21 the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

#### 22 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

23 Funds available to General Services Administration for  
 24 administrative operations, in support of program activities,  
 25 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through



1 a single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That  
2 costs and obligations for such administrative operations for  
3 the respective program activities shall be accounted for in  
4 accordance with systems approved by the General Ac-  
5 counting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount  
6 deposited into said account for the fiscal year 1962 from  
7 funds made available to General Services Administration  
8 in this Act shall not exceed \$14,268,900: *Provided further*,  
9 That amounts deposited into said account for administrative  
10 operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts  
11 included in the respective program appropriations for such  
12 purposes.

### 13 GENERAL PROVISIONS

14 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the  
15 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)  
16 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,  
17 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from  
18 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;  
19 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to  
20 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the  
21 General Services Administration, issued by public authorities,  
22 States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect  
23 to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems  
24 necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request

1 and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from  
2 the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropria-  
3 tions or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to  
4 the General Services Administration, in connection with  
5 property transferred to the General Services Administration  
6 pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff),  
7 and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with  
8 the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

9       Appropriations under the heading "Construction, Public  
10 Buildings Projects" shall be available for (1) acquisition of  
11 buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or  
12 otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2)  
13 extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and  
14 (3) construction of projects for new public buildings ap-  
15 proved pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959, in  
16 addition to those set forth under that appropriation.

17       Funds available to the General Services Administration  
18 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

19       No part of any money appropriated by this or any  
20 other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the  
21 Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for  
22 the purchase within the continental limits of the United  
23 States of any typewriting machines except in accordance



1 with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the  
2 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,  
3 as amended.

4 Appropriations available to any department or agency  
5 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, in-  
6 cluding maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be  
7 available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services  
8 Administration for those expenses of renovation and altera-  
9 tion of buildings and facilities which constitute public im-  
10 provements, performed in accordance with the Public Build-  
11 ings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law,  
12 and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropria-  
13 tions to said Administration for rents and related expenses,  
14 not otherwise provided for, of providing, directly or indi-  
15 rectly, such suitable general purpose space as may be re-  
16 quired by any such department or agency, in the District  
17 of Columbia or elsewhere.

## 18 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### 19 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

#### 20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Adminis-  
22 trator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the  
23 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and purchase of  
24 two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$12,-  
25 900,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of inspections

1 and of providing representatives at the site of projects being  
2 planned or undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to  
3 title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects  
4 financed through loans to educational institutions author-  
5 ized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended,  
6 projects and facilities financed by loans to public agencies  
7 pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as  
8 amended, urban planning financed through grants to State  
9 and local government agencies pursuant to title VII of the  
10 Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and reserves of planned  
11 public works financed through advances to municipalities  
12 and other public agencies pursuant to title VII of the Hous-  
13 ing Act of 1954, as amended, shall be compensated by such  
14 agencies or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in  
15 the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services,  
16 and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadmin-  
17 istrative; and for the purpose of providing such inspections,  
18 the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency  
19 may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from  
20 such institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such  
21 amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such  
22 charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses  
23 shall not exceed \$3,000,000.

#### 24 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

25 For grants in accordance with the provisions of sec-



1 tion 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$3,600,-  
2 000.

3 PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

4 For the revolving fund established pursuant to section  
5 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C.  
6 462), \$6,000,000.

7 URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
8 AUTHORIZATION)

9 For an additional amount for payment of grants as au-  
10 thorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended  
11 (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$200,000,000.

12 URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

13 For urban studies and housing research as authorized by  
14 the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, includ-  
15 ing administrative expenses in connection therewith,  
16 \$450,000.

17 HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

18 For the revolving fund established pursuant to section  
19 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$25,000,000: *Provided*,  
20 That not to exceed \$350,000 of the foregoing amount shall  
21 be available for administrative expenses during the current  
22 fiscal year.

23 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

24 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

25 For the payment of annual contributions to public  
26 housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United

1 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),  
2 \$165,000,000.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

4 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing  
5 Administration, \$13,968,000, to be expended under the  
6 authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this  
7 Act.

8 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce  
11 Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the em-  
12 ployment of special counsel; services as authorized by section  
13 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and pur-  
14 chase of not to exceed forty-two passenger motor vehicles of  
15 which thirty-six shall be for replacement only; \$21,950,000,  
16 of which not less than \$1,696,700 shall be available for  
17 expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and  
18 not less than \$1,129,000 shall be available for expenses nec-  
19 essary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Pro-*  
20 *vided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State  
21 commissioners may use Government transportation requests  
22 when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

## 1 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

## 2 ADMINISTRATION

## 3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of  
5 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, includ-  
6 ing not to exceed \$8,000,000 for expenses of travel, and  
7 uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of  
8 September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$191,-  
9 750,000.

## 10 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

11 For contractual research, development, operations, tech-  
12 nical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction,  
13 and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the  
14 conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and  
15 development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space  
16 Administration, including maintenance and operation of  
17 aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of  
18 fourteen passenger motor vehicles, including one at not to  
19 exceed \$6,000, of which seven shall be for replacement only;  
20 \$892,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,*  
21 That no part of this appropriation shall be available for pay-  
22 ment of salaries of National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-  
23 tration personnel.



## CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$116,250,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be available for emergency construction of facilities in accord with section 3 of the legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year 1962, to remain available until expended.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation shall not be thereby increased.

Not to exceed \$15,000 of appropriations in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for such scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense as may be authorized by law.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales,

1 leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury  
2 of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so  
3 long as funds are available from appropriations for the  
4 foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the  
5 Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Con-  
6 gress), shall not be effective.

## 7 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### 8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
10 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42  
11 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellow-  
12 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
13 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire of passenger motor  
14 vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Admin-  
15 istration for security guard services; \$250,000,000, to re-  
16 main available until expended: *Provided*, That of the fore-  
17 going amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be available  
18 for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a  
19 program of supplementary training for secondary school  
20 science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That  
21 not to exceed \$1,600,000 of the foregoing appropriation  
22 may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue  
23 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
24 Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for  
25 the purposes authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act.

## 1                    RENEGOTIATION BOARD

## 2                    SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3            For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-  
4    cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as  
5    authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
6    U.S.C. 55a), \$2,900,000.

## 7                    SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

## 8                    SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9            For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-  
10    ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and  
11    services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
12    1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$11,000,000.

## 13                   SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

## 14                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15           For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-  
16    nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I  
17    of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62  
18    Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by  
19    section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);  
20    not to exceed \$62,000 for the National Selective Service Ap-  
21    peal Board; and \$19,000 for the National Advisory Commit-  
22    tee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Spe-  
23    cialists; \$33,670,000: *Provided*, That during the current  
24    fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation  
25    from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the



1 Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such  
2 action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

3 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

4 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

5 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-  
6 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses  
7 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-  
8 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; and  
9 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
10 security guard service; \$161,500,000: *Provided*, That no  
11 part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of  
12 twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Pro-*  
13 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be  
14 used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifi-  
15 cations of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a  
16 rate in excess of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran en-  
17 rolled in and attending such institution.

18 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

19 OPERATING EXPENSES

20 For expenses necessary for administration of the medi-  
21 cal, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research,  
22 employee education and training activities, and expenses nec-  
23 essary for carrying out programs of medical research, as  
24 authorized by law, \$40,700,000, of which \$27,000,000 shall

1 be available for medical research: *Provided*, That \$1,-  
2 000,000 of the foregoing appropriations shall remain avail-  
3 able until expended for prosthetic testing and development.

#### 4 MEDICAL CARE

5 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-  
6 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as  
7 authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treat-  
8 ment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration includ-  
9 ing care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction  
10 of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational  
11 articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms;  
12 repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the  
13 several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the  
14 Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either  
15 by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and  
16 purchase of materials; purchase of seventy-two passenger  
17 motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances  
18 therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid  
19 to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,  
20 United States Code; \$987,171,000, plus reimbursements:  
21 *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from  
22 this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education,  
23 and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy,  
24 and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them

1 under the various headings of their applicable appropriations,  
2 of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment  
3 of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

4 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

5 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,  
6 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-  
7 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence al-  
8 lowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any  
9 Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon,  
10 including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities,  
11 the administration of which is now or may hereafter be  
12 placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment  
13 of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and  
14 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, \$3,500,000,-  
15 000, to remain available until expended.

16 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

17 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans  
18 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment  
19 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and  
20 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-  
21 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38,  
22 United States Code, \$80,000,000, to remain available un-  
23 til expended.



## VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, \$39,200,000, to remain available until expended.

## GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, \$1,000,000.

## CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY

## FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for technical services for replacement of the general medical and surgical hospital at

1 Nashville, Tennessee, is reduced from “\$1,500,000” to  
2 “\$921,600”.

3 LOAN GUARANTEE REVOLVING FUND

4 During the current fiscal year, the Loan guarantee  
5 revolving fund shall be available for expenses, but not to  
6 exceed \$120,624,000, for property acquisitions and other  
7 loan guarantee and insurance operations under Chapter 37,  
8 Title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses,  
9 as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That  
10 the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and  
11 reserves revolving fund shall be available, during the current  
12 fiscal year, for transfer to said Loan guarantee revolving  
13 fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the  
14 foregoing expenses.

15 SUPPLY FUND

16 During the current fiscal year, the Supply fund shall be  
17 available for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

19 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the  
20 current fiscal year for “Compensation and pensions”, “Read-  
21 justment benefits”, and “Veterans insurance and indemn-  
22 ities” may be transferred to any other of the mentioned ap-  
23 propriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-  
24 priations so augmented.

25 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-  
26 tion for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall

1 be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the  
2 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

3 The appropriation available to the Veterans Adminis-  
4 tration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall  
5 be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental  
6 thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of  
7 title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Vet-  
8 erans Administration receiving care under such appropria-  
9 tions.

10 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-  
11 erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Con-  
12 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be  
13 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the con-  
14 struction of any new hospital or home.

15 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-  
16 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except  
17 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits  
18 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ap-  
19 propriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administra-  
20 tor of Veterans Affairs.

## 21 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-  
23 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-  
24 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel  
25 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in



1 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*  
2 *vided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed  
3 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards  
4 of the Selective Service System, or to travel performed in  
5 connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the  
6 Civil Aeronautics Board.

7 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in  
8 this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person  
9 filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly  
10 held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces  
11 of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his  
12 period of active military or naval service and has within  
13 ninety days after his release from such service or from hos-  
14 pitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not  
15 more than one year made application for restoration to his  
16 former position and has been certified by the Civil Service  
17 Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his  
18 former position and has not been restored thereto.

19 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available  
20 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase  
21 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new  
22 offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this  
23 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been ap-  
24 proved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

## TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1962 for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

## FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

## LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Not to exceed a total of \$1,725,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals, and shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal

1 years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment  
2 for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the  
3 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan In-  
4 surance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government  
5 (including payment for office space): *Provided*, That all  
6 necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship  
7 of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan In-  
8 surance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-  
9 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan  
10 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act  
11 and all necessary expenses (including services performed  
12 on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal  
13 services) in connection with the handling, including the  
14 purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Fed-  
15 eral home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement  
16 of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the  
17 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-  
18 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes  
19 hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates  
20 of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be  
21 entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by  
22 the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance  
23 at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council  
24 and may be paid not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of  
25 subsistence: *Provided further*, That expenses of any func-



1 tions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks)  
2 vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as  
3 nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That, not-  
4 withstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for  
5 the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the admin-  
6 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall  
7 be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the pro-  
8 visions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22,  
9 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Provided fur-*  
10 *ther*, That the nonadministrative expenses (except those  
11 included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and  
12 examination of Federal and State chartered institutions  
13 (other than special examinations determined by the Board  
14 to be necessary) shall not exceed \$10,366,000.

15 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL  
16 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

17 Not to exceed \$890,000 shall be available for adminis-  
18 trative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall  
19 be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capital-  
20 ized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation  
21 of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of pro-  
22 ceedings under section 407 of the National Housing Act,  
23 liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured  
24 institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward  
25 the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the

1 case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and pay-  
2 ments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board  
3 determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said  
4 Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make  
5 payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan  
6 banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan  
7 Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Pro-*  
8 *vided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act,  
9 except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified,  
10 the administrative expenses and other obligations of said  
11 Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance  
12 with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12  
13 U.S.C. 1724-1730a).

14           GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION  
15   LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-  
16       STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION  
17       FUND

18       Not to exceed \$42,500 (to be computed on an accrual  
19 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of  
20 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General  
21 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1  
22 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the cur-  
23 rent fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the  
24 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein  
25 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to in-

1 clude all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-  
2 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including  
3 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative  
4 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of serv-  
5 ices performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with  
6 the termination of contracts or in the performance of legal  
7 services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of admin-  
8 istrative expenses to the account shall be made in accord-  
9 ance with generally recognized accounting principles and  
10 practices.

## 11 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### 12 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF 13 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

14 Not to exceed \$1,900,000 shall be available for all ad-  
15 ministrative expenses of carrying out the functions of the Ad-  
16 ministrator under the program of housing loans to educa-  
17 tional institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as  
18 amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall be  
19 exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal  
20 Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-  
21 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the  
22 Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation  
23 (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264)  
24 which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury  
25 as a depository of public money of the United States.



1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
2 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

3 Not to exceed \$650,000 of funds in the revolving fund  
4 established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments  
5 of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative  
6 expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for  
7 services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any  
8 member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any in-  
9 sured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Fed-  
10 eral Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23,  
11 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been desig-  
12 nated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of  
13 public money of the United States.

14 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
15 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-  
16 ING PROGRAMS)

17 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$145,000  
18 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this  
19 amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case  
20 of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Gov-  
21 ernment and legal services on a contract or fee basis and  
22 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve  
23 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the  
24 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-  
25 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the

1 Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal  
2 Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has  
3 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-  
4 pository of public money of the United States.

5 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL  
6 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

7 Not to exceed \$7,400,000 shall be available for admin-  
8 istrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and  
9 shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including ex-  
10 penses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or  
11 fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of  
12 securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures,  
13 fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services  
14 performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not  
15 including other personal services) in connection with the  
16 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improve-  
17 ment, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to  
18 said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries,  
19 wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed out-  
20 side of the continental United States, expenses of services  
21 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the  
22 performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses  
23 reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said As-  
24 sociation may utilize and may make payment for services  
25 and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies

1 of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of ad-  
2 ministrative expenses to the accounts of the Association  
3 shall be made in accordance with generally recognized ac-  
4 counting principles and practices.

5 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-  
6 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

7 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-  
8 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$9,600,000  
9 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration  
10 shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing  
11 Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or  
12 allowances therefore, as authorized by the Act of September  
13 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) : *Provided*, That funds  
14 shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to ex-  
15 ceed \$1,500) : *Provided further*, That nonadministrative ex-  
16 penses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2  
17 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all  
18 appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing  
19 shall not exceed \$58,000,000.

20 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-  
21 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

22 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-  
23 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the admin-  
24 istrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in



1 carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act  
2 of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433), including  
3 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by  
4 the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) :  
5 *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representa-  
6 tives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal proj-  
7 ects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal  
8 projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Ad-  
9 ministration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the  
10 payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to  
11 the development costs of such projects will cover the costs  
12 of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Ad-  
13 ministration for such purpose shall be considered nonad-  
14 ministrative expenses, and funds received from such pay-  
15 ments may be used only for the payment of necessary ex-  
16 penses of providing representatives of the Administration  
17 at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That  
18 all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not spe-  
19 cifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties im-  
20 posed by law, shall not exceed \$1,200,000.

### 21 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in  
23 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any

1 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for  
2 publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or  
3 defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

4 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in  
5 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
6 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to  
7 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel  
8 work in excess of the number that would be provided by a  
9 ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five,  
10 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent em-  
11 ployees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*,  
12 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-  
13 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend halftime  
14 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction  
15 and administration of the personnel program; employment,  
16 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;  
17 employee relations and services; wage administration; and  
18 processing, recording, and reporting.

19 SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in  
20 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
21 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for  
22 construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or  
23 leased buildings except where specifically provided.

1        This Act may be cited as the “Independent Offices Ap-  
 2        propriation Act, 1962”.

Passed the House of Representatives June 7, 1961.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*



---

## AN ACT

---

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

---

JUNE 8, 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Appropriations







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

### CONTENTS

Issued July 17, 1961  
For actions of July 14, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 118

|                                  |        |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Adjournment.....                 | 18     |
| Agricultural appropriations..... | 3      |
| Appropriations.....              | 3,4,22 |
| Atomic energy.....               | 22     |
| Conflict of interest.....        | 28     |
| Cultural exchanges.....          | 32     |
| Durum wheat.....                 | 2      |
| Expenditures.....                | 23     |
| Farm labor.....                  | 10     |
| Farm loans.....                  | 29     |
| Farm program.....                | 7,21   |
| Food for peace.....              | 9      |
| Foreign aid.....                 | 34     |
| Foreign trade.....               | 25     |
| Hay.....                         | 1      |
| Horsemeat.....                   | 16     |
| Monopolies.....                  | 26     |
| Natural resources.....           | 27     |

|                          |         |
|--------------------------|---------|
| Per diem.....            | 5       |
| Peace Corps.....         | 15      |
| Personnel.....           | 5,28,30 |
| Procurement.....         | 26      |
| Reclamation.....         | 20      |
| Retirement.....          | 5,17    |
| St. Lawrence Seaway..... | 19      |
| Soil bank.....           | 1       |
| Travel.....              | 5       |
| Tariffs.....             | 13,33   |
| Textiles.....            | 11      |
| Transportation.....      | 31      |
| Youth corps.....         | 14      |
| Water pollution.....     | 12      |
| Water resources.....     | 6,24,27 |
| Watersheds.....          | 8       |

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate reconsidered and passed bill to permit removal of hay on conservation reserve acreage adjacent to disaster areas. Conferees agreed to file report on agricultural appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill to increase per diem travel rates. Senate passed bill to continue exemption of durum wheat production in certain Calif. counties from allotments and quotas. Senate subcommittee voted to report HEW and independent offices appropriation bills. Senate received from President and Sen. Anderson introduced and discussed water resources planning bill.

### SENATE

- 1. SOIL BANK; HAY.** Reconsidered and passed with amendments S. 2197, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the removal of hay from, or grazing on, conservation reserve lands adjacent to or near disaster areas (pp. 11694, 11700-07, 11715). This bill was passed on July 12, but Sen. Williams, Del., later entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. Agreed to amendments by Sen. Williams, Del., to provide that the President, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture, shall have authority to determine when areas shall be declared disaster areas, and to provide that the provisions of the bill shall expire on June 30, 1962.
- 2. DURUM WHEAT.** Passed as reported S. 1107, to continue the exemption of production of Durum wheat in portions of Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from acreage allotments and marketing quota restrictions. p. 11719
- 3. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962.** The "Daily Digest" states, "Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House passed versions of H. R. 7444, fiscal 1962 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies." p. D572



APPROPRIATIONS.

- 4./ A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments to the full committee H. R. 7445, fiscal 1962 appropriations for independent offices. p. D570
- ~~A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments to the full committee H. R. 7035, fiscal 1962 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. p. D570~~
5. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with <sup>out</sup> amendment H. R. 5432, to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund (S. Rept. 545), and with amendment H. R. 3279, to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business (S. Rept. 544). p. 11640
6. WATER RESOURCES. Received from the President a proposed bill "to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 11636
- Received from the Governors' Conference a resolution favoring Congressional consent to the Delaware River Basin Compact and the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. p. 11640
7. FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee has issued a summary of S. 1643, the omnibus farm bill, as it was ordered reported by the Committee on July 12 (see Digest 116). Attached to this Digest is a copy of the summary issued by the Committee.
- Received from the Wisconsin Better Government Committee a resolution protesting against S. 1643 and H. R. 6400, the omnibus farm bills; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 11637
8. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on Big Creek, Ark.; Ulatis Creek, Calif.; South Branch Park River, Conn.; Indian Creek and Pony Creek, Iowa; Frog Creek, Kans.; Big Reedy Creek and Humphrey-Clanton Creek, Ky.; South Branch Cass River, Mich; Plum Creek, Nebr.; Upper Red Rock Creek, Okla.; Brodhead Creek, Pa.; Anasco River, Puerto Rico; and Houser Creek, Tenn.; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 11636
- Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on Big Sandy Creek (supplement), Colo.; South River, Ga.; Middle Fork of Anderson River, Ind.; Middle-South Branch Forest River, N. Dak.; and Twin Parks, Wis., to Public Works Committee. p. 11637
9. FOOD FOR PEACE. Sen. Neuberger inserted an address by Sen. Humphrey at the First National Conference of the American Food for Peace Council in support of the food for peace program. pp. 11661-4
- Sen. Keating inserted an article, "Peace Corps Program in India -- Literacy House," and said "I am very happy to report that ... under the terms of Public Law 480, \$151,000 in local currency will be made available to supplement this work." pp. 11687-8
10. MIGRANT LABOR. Sen. Neuberger inserted an article, "Voiceless People," and said, "It has long been the hope and aspiration of many conscientious Americans to extend economic and social justice to our migratory farmworkers." pp. 11664-5







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

### CONTENTS

Issued July 26, 1961  
For actions of July 25, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 124

|                          |               |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Advisory groups.....     | 1             |
| Appropriations.....      | 2,12          |
| Cooperatives.....        | 1             |
| Education.....           | 4,22,27,32    |
| Electrification.....     | 24            |
| Durum wheat.....         | 1             |
| Farm housing.....        | 35            |
| Farm labor.....          | 3,38          |
| Farm loans.....          | 30            |
| Farm program.....        | 1,10,11,16,23 |
| Farm safety.....         | 20            |
| Federal aid.....         | 19,34         |
| Feed grains.....         | 1             |
| Food stamps.....         | 17            |
| Foreign affairs.....     | 26            |
| Foreign aid.....         | 5,10          |
| Foreign trade.....       | 25            |
| Forestry.....            | 7,21          |
| Information.....         | 23            |
| Lands.....               | 7,15          |
| Legislative program..... | 10,16         |

|                          |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Livestock diseases.....  | 8     |
| Livestock loans.....     | 1     |
| Manpower.....            | 9     |
| Marketing.....           | 18    |
| Marketing orders.....    | 1     |
| Milk.....                | 1     |
| Minerals.....            | 15    |
| Payments.....            | 14    |
| Per diem.....            | 1     |
| Personnel.....           | 18    |
| Postal rates.....        | 33    |
| Publications.....        | 23    |
| Regulatory agencies..... | 37    |
| Tobacco.....             | 13    |
| Transportation.....      | 29,31 |
| Vehicles.....            | 36    |
| Water resources.....     | 6     |
| Wheat.....               | 1,28  |

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate debated farm bill. House Rules Committee cleared farm bill. Senate committee reported bill to extend Mexican farm labor program. House subcommittee voted to report bill for lease and transfer of tobacco allotments. Senate agreed to conference report on general Government matters-Commerce appropriation bill. Senate committee reported Labor-HEW and independent offices appropriation bills.

### SENATE

1. **FARM PROGRAM.** Continued debate on S. 1643, the omnibus farm bill (pp. 12329, 12346-86, 12389, 12396-403).

Agreed to the following amendments:

By Sen. Holland to except from the provisions of the bill a provision which would have repealed the authority for special livestock loans. Sen. Holland explained that Congress recently passed legislation extending authority for such loans. pp. 12346-7

By Sen. Young, N. Dak., to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to increase acreage allotments for the production of Durum wheat, whenever he determines that production is inadequate to meet demand, in addition to the farm acreage allotments for other types of wheat. In response to a question by Sen. Ellender, Sen. Young explained that the purpose of the amendment was "to take care of farmers who grow both Durum wheat and other varieties of wheat." pp. 12356-8

By Sen. Mundt to provide that the Secretary shall require producers to take such measures as he may deem appropriate to keep diverted wheat acreage free from grasshopper infestation, weeds, and rodents. pp. 12358-61



By Sen. Miller to modify the language of the bill extending the feed grains program for one year so as "to incorporate in the bill the exact language which appears in the emergency feed grains bill passed earlier in the session" of Congress. p. 12396

By Sen. Williams, Del., to insert additional language relating to marketing orders which he explained as follows: "First, it provides that the initial marketing order shall be submitted to the interested parties and voted upon prior to being declared in effect. It would make the holding of a referendum mandatory in the case of an initial order. Second, it provides that the order shall be described on the ballot, in order that those voting can more clearly understand the question before them. The amendment would also provide for referendums to determine processor approval of an order where such processor approval is required." pp. 12396-402

By Sen. Case to provide that any per diem paid to any of the members of advisory groups be limited to that provided by law for Federal employees under the Travel Expense Act of 1949. pp. 12402-3

Rejected the following amendments:

By Sen. Burdick to provide, as he explained, "that in areas which have been declared disaster areas in the wheat sections of this Nation, where a farmer has a production which is less than 50 percent of the expected production based upon the 1959-60 period, he shall at his option retire as much acreage as he wishes, up to 40 percent. In other words, it would exempt such farmer from the 10-percent mandatory cut provided in the wheat section of the bill if he asks for it." pp. 12353-6.

By Sen. Kefauver, 39 to 57, to strike out the section of the bill affirming the right of farmer cooperatives to act jointly in a federation of such cooperative associations, or through agencies in common, in performing those acts which farmers acting together in one such association may lawfully perform. Agreed to a motion by Sen. Holland to table a motion by Sen. Ellender to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected. pp. 12363-86, 12389

Sen. Proxmire submitted, but later withdrew, a proposed amendment to provide a self-help milk program which "would permit milk producers to work out allotment programs for the marketing of milk." pp. 12349-53

Agreed to a unanimous consent request by Sen. Mansfield that beginning Wed., July 26, further debate will be limited to 2 hours on any amendment and to 2 hours on final passage of the bill. p. 12384

2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 7035, the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, appropriation bill for 1962 (S. Rept. 618), and H. R. 7445, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1962 (S. Rept. 620). p. 12321

~~Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7577, the General Government Matters-Commerce Appropriation bill for 1962, and concurred in the House action on amendments in disagreement (pp. 12334-40). For items of interest, see Digest 121.~~

3. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2010, to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to extend the Mexican farm labor program (S. Rept. 619). pp. 12321-2

4. EDUCATION. Sen. Fong supported the extension of Federal school assistance to federally impacted areas. pp. 12330-1



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

JULY 25, 1961.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted  
the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 7445]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Amount of bill as passed House.....                        | \$8, 404, 098, 000 |
| Amount of increase by Senate.....                          | 694, 516, 500      |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate.....                  | 9, 098, 614, 500   |
| Amount of appropriations 1961.....                         | 8, 493, 543, 400   |
| Amount of regular and supplemental estimates,<br>1962..... | 9, 174, 561, 000   |
| The bill as reported to the Senate:                        |                    |
| Under the estimates for 1962.....                          | 75, 946, 500       |
| Over the appropriations for 1961.....                      | 605, 071, 100      |

## GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill provides a total amount of \$9,098,614,500, which is \$605,071,100 over the appropriations for 1961, \$75,946,500 under the estimates for 1962, and an increase of \$694,516,500 over the House bill.

The committee recommendations are based upon the same estimates as were considered by the House, including the budget amendments in House Document Nos. 125, 129, 156, 157, 158, and 162.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested the committee to include the funds estimated in House Document No. 179 for the advanced program of manned orbital landings and intermediate manned space missions, amounting to \$549 million. Public Law No. 87-98, approved July 21, 1961, authorizes these advanced programs, and the committee has included in its consideration the additional budget amendments in House Document No. 179.

The House exceeded the budget estimate by \$6 million for construction of a hangar at Dulles International Airport, which the committee does not agree with, and by \$40,000 for the Administrator of General Services Administration and by \$5 million for VA medical research, which the committee fully favors.

The committee recommends additional amounts over the budget estimates, as follows:

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| To OCDM, to accelerate the radiological defense equipment program.....   | \$2, 500, 000 |
| To GSA, to provide construction funds for 4 additional buildings.....  | 13, 131, 500  |
| To GSA, to provide sites and expenses funds for all authorized public buildings projects, in line with the intention of the House committee..... | 20, 000, 000  |
| To VA, to further increase medical research.....   | 5, 000, 000   |
| To VA, to provide facilities for medical research.....   | 2, 500, 000   |

Summaries for the 23 agencies in the bill, in comparison with the budget estimates and the House allowances, are shown in the following table, and the tabulation by items of appropriations is included at the end of the report.

| Agency   | Budget estimates, 1962 | House allowance  | Senate recommendation |
|--|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| National Aeronautics and Space Council.....        | \$320, 000             | \$320, 000       | \$320, 000            |
| Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....      | 104, 200, 000          | 79, 167, 000     | 95, 500, 000          |
| Disaster relief.....                               | 6, 000, 000            | 6, 000, 000      | 6, 000, 000           |
| Civil Aeronautics Board.....                       | 90, 750, 000           | 83, 700, 000     | 90, 600, 000          |
| Civil Service Commission.....                      | 95, 502, 000           | 91, 844, 000     | 92, 484, 000          |
| Federal Aviation Agency.....                       | 744, 300, 000          | 723, 500, 000    | 736, 677, 000         |
| Federal Communications Commission.....             | 12, 525, 000           | 12, 400, 000     | 12, 525, 000          |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....                  | 1(12, 981, 000)        | 1(12, 981, 000)  | 1(12, 981, 000)       |
| Federal Power Commission.....                      | 8, 793, 000            | 8, 793, 000      | 8, 793, 000           |
| Federal Trade Commission.....                      | 10, 690, 000           | 10, 000, 000     | 10, 690, 000          |
| General Accounting Office.....                     | 43, 000, 000           | 43, 000, 000     | 43, 000, 000          |
| General Services Administration.....               | 556, 105, 000          | 539, 325, 000    | 580, 382, 500         |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency.....               | 262, 050, 000          | 247, 950, 000    | 249, 500, 000         |
| Federal National Mortgage Association.....         | 1(7, 450, 000)         | 1(7, 400, 000)   | 1(7, 400, 000)        |
| Federal Housing Administration.....                | 1(71, 975, 000)        | 1(67, 600, 000)  | 1(70, 900, 000)       |
| Public Housing Administration.....                 | 183, 450, 000          | 178, 968, 000    | 178, 968, 000         |
| Interstate Commerce Commission.....                | 22, 200, 000           | 21, 950, 000     | 22, 200, 000          |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration..... | 1, 784, 300, 000       | 1, 200, 000, 000 | 1, 749, 000, 000      |
| National Capital Housing Authority.....            | 40, 000                | 40, 000          | -----                 |
| National Science Foundation.....                   | 277, 000, 000          | 250, 000, 000    | 276, 500, 000         |
| Renegotiation Board.....                           | 3, 000, 000            | 2, 900, 000      | 2, 900, 000           |
| Securities and Exchange Commission.....            | 11, 015, 000           | 11, 000, 000     | 11, 000, 000          |
| Selective Service System.....                      | 34, 475, 000           | 33, 670, 000     | 33, 670, 000          |
| Veterans' Administration.....                      | 4, 924, 846, 000       | 4, 879, 571, 000 | 4, 893, 970, 000      |
| Total.....   | 9, 174, 561, 000       | 8, 404, 098, 000 | 9, 098, 614, 500      |

<sup>1</sup> Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses.

## EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 1961 appropriation (allocation from emergency fund)----- | -----      |
| Estimate, 1962 (H. Doc. 158)-----                        | \$320, 000 |
| House allowance-----                                     | 320, 000   |
| Committee recommendation-----                            | 320, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of the full budget estimate of \$320,000 for salaries and expenses of the Council, authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 and under recent amendment located in the Executive Office of the President with the Vice President as Chairman. The purpose of the Council is to advise and assist the President, as he may request, with respect to the performance of functions in the aeronautics and space field.

## OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$25, 346, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 30, 500, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 25, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 25, 000, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$25 million for salaries and expenses, which continues the 1961 level of operations and is \$5,500,000 below the budget estimate. The committee feels that further needs can await consideration on the supplemental appropriation bill after pending changes in the functions of the office have been determined.

The committee recommends inserting authorization for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed \$6,000; increasing the limitation for emergency and extraordinary expenses from \$3,000 to \$6,000; excluding from the travel limitation the rental of passenger motor vehicles from General Services Administration; and deleting the proviso limiting positions in the District of Columbia area to 303.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF  
FEDERAL AGENCIES

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$6, 567, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 8, 700, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 6, 567, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 5, 000, 000   |

The committee recommends \$5 million for civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies, which is a reduction of \$1,567,000 below the House allowance at the 1961 level and \$3,700,000 below the budget estimate. The committee believes that many of these delegated functions are not required to be continued indefinitely.

## EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$9, 175, 000 |
| Estimate 1962 (January)-----  | 36, 000, 000  |
| House allowance-----          | 21, 600, 000  |
| Committee recommendation----- | 38, 500, 000  |



The committee recommends an appropriation of \$38,500,000 for emergency supplies and equipment, which is a restoration of \$14,400,000 plus \$2,500,000 over the budget estimate.

Of this amount, \$24,850,000 is for medical supplies and equipment. The committee is advised that the House reduction of one-half would postpone current scheduling of medical stockpiling and require larger expenditures in future years in order to reach the ultimate goal, recently confirmed by an exhaustive study, of an additional stockpile requiring \$750 million worth of supplies and equipment to provide medical facilities for the surviving population following an attack upon this country.

For radiological defense equipment, the committee recommends adding \$2,500,000 over the restoration of \$1,500,000, to provide a total amount of \$8,115,000, for the purpose of accelerating the procurement of instruments and training of operations for the national fixed station monitoring network in order to assure the establishment of at least 100,000 Federal, State, and local stations by June 30, 1963.

#### OBSOLESCENT DRUGS

In restoring the budget estimate for medical supplies, the necessary amounts are included for replacement and reworking of outdated antibiotics, blood plasmas, and derivatives. In this connection, the committee is advised that many medical stockpile items, particularly antibiotics, have a definite shelf life, and when rotated in the procurement program near the end of such shelf life they are still valuable but are replaced with a brandnew item which has a longer life; and other items become obsolescent before the end of the shelf life and are replaced with an improved drug which has less side reactions and more therapeutic effect, creating a loss to the stockpile. The committee understands that the Director has authority to dispose of such obsolescent or unused drug items, and the committee urges the Director to arrange, on an equitable basis, for the disposal of such items as he deems feasible to charitable and nonprofit institutions.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$4, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 4, 500, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 1, 500, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 2, 500, 000   |

Restoration is recommended by the committee of \$1 million, to provide a total amount of \$2,500,000 for research and development, which is \$2 million below the budget estimate.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation (\$2,400,000 in 1960 supp.)..... | None          |
| Estimate, 1962 (January).....                       | \$2, 500, 000 |
| House allowance.....                                | 2, 500, 000   |
| Committee recommendation.....                       | 2, 500, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House in providing the full amount of the budget estimate of \$2,500,000 for construction of facilities, to be used for constructing the second regional emergency operations center in the area of Harvard, Mass.

The first center is under construction at Denton, Tex., and the committee is advised that \$335,000 additional is needed to complete it. The committee authorizes the Director to use that amount from this appropriation, if necessary to obtain a functional facility.

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$7, 852, 500 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 8, 950, 000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 129.....    | 9, 050, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 8, 900, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 8, 900, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$8,900,000 for salaries and expenses, which is \$150,000 below the revised budget estimate.

### PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$82, 500, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 81, 700, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 74, 800, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 81, 700, 000   |

The committee recommends restoration of \$6,900,000, to provide the budget estimate of \$81,700,000 for payments to air carriers. The restoration consists of \$1,900,000 for helicopter operations and \$5 million for other subsidy payments in 1962.

The committee further recommends that the limitation on the amount available for subsidy for helicopter operations be increased from \$5 million to \$6,900,000, the budget estimate.

### HELICOPTER OPERATIONS

The committee heard extensive testimony from the Board and from the three helicopter operators presently certificated and providing services, mainly with rotary-wing aircraft, in the three major metropolitan areas of Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York. The Board advised the committee that they believe that the helicopter operations it has certificated and the subsidies expended for operations under those certificates have been in the public interest. The committee is convinced that, with the advent of jet service, transcontinental flights taking approximately 4½ hours have little meaning if from 1 to 2 hours is required for the surface transportation upon departure or arrival of destination, and the Board assures the committee that there is increased use of helicopters by all classes of traffic for transfer between airports in the three communities now serviced as well as transfer of passengers from the airports to the outlying suburban communities.

The helicopter carriers were certificated for three specific purposes: (1) to expedite metropolitan mail deliveries to the central post office; (2) to assist in the development of rotary-wing aircraft for national defense purposes; and (3) to determine the feasibility of transportation of passengers, in addition to mail and property, between the centers of cities or their airports to suburban and outlying areas. The Post Office Department has continuously used these services; the Department of Defense has recognized their contributions to the development and operation of military helicopter aircraft, with esti-



ated savings exceeding the subsidies; and all three carriers are now carrying passengers (totaling 490,000 in 1960) as well as property and mail.

The committee is advised that an ultimate increase in revenue from the transportation of passengers is anticipated through the development of helicopter aircraft capable of carrying a greater number of passengers at lower operating cost. The new twin turbine-powered helicopters, carrying about 25 passengers, will have a seat-mile operating cost of 12 cents compared to 29 cents for the 15-or-less passenger reciprocating engine helicopters now in commercial use. In January of this year the Board approved an application by one of these carriers for Government guarantee of a loan to purchase such improved aircraft, and applications from the other carriers are being processed. The repayment of such loans will require 6 years.

Subsidies for a full year of operation with 13 of the improved helicopters are estimated to total \$9 million for the 3 carriers, at first, and to gradually drop each year thereafter.

The committee is advised that some 35 or more helicopter carriers are not certificated by the Board, due to their weight category, but are authorized by local commissions. Applications for certificates are on file with the Board from some 88 carriers throughout the country, and the committee is advised that action on them depends upon the determination of a current investigation as to whether public convenience and necessity requires a helicopter operation in the Washington-Dulles-Baltimore area and whether such operation must or should be subsidized.

The committee is strongly of the opinion that the helicopter subsidy should be ended at the earliest opportunity. It realizes that further development of the helicopter can be profitably entertained. It urges the Civil Aeronautics Board to maintain close supervision of this service and this development and be prepared to inform the committee fully in the next session as to how long it will take to put this service on a self-supporting basis and end the subsidies for helicopter development. The committee, at the same time, realizes that the U.S. mail service is assisted by this service and expects this use of the helicopter to be improved or expanded.

As to the enlargement of the certificated carriers to other sections of the country, the committee requests the Board to report at the 1963 budget hearings on the progress that has been made in the public interest in this regard. Should the Board report that such enlargement is feasible, the committee expects the Board to request the funds required to do so.

#### INCREASING NONPRIORITY MAIL VOLUME

In its report on the 1960 independent offices appropriations bill (S. Rept. 423, 86th Cong.) the committee expressed the belief that the subsidy payments to local service and helicopter service airlines could be reduced by a cooperative effort between the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Post Office Department to increase the volume of nonpriority mail being transported by such carriers. The committee pointed out that these carriers have unused capacity which



would permit them to handle substantially greater volumes of such mail and that their use for this purpose would substantially reduce the subsidy requirements of this group of carriers without significant increase in the cost to the Post Office Department of transporting the mail involved. The committee requested that the Civil Aeronautics Board institute discussions with the Post Office Department to effect the action suggested.

The committee urgently renews its recommendation for such action in view of the rising cost of subsidy to these carriers. The committee is aware that following its previous recommendation some increased use has been made of local service carriers, but is convinced that a much more comprehensive and effective use can still be made. There is no justification for the Government not receiving useful mail service from payments to these carriers.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$20, 761, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 21, 829, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 21, 029, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 21, 669, 000   |

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$21,669,000 for salaries and expenses, which is \$640,000 over the House allowance and \$160,000 under the budget estimate. Restorations amounting to \$414,000 are included in the increase, to establish a Federal employment statistical program, to upgrade furniture in the regional and branch offices, and to cover personnel benefits for the additional employees above last year.

An addition of \$226,000 is recommended by the committee, in response to an authorized amendment submitted at the Senate hearings, to finance the added workload for conducting postmaster examinations. The committee is advised that the improvement and strengthening of the qualification standards caused the cancellation of lists of eligibles on existing registers as well as the deferment of some new examinations, and the additional workload is expected from the announcement of 1,768 postmaster examinations, with accompanying tasks. The work is planned for two years, and the amount recommended is for half, with the balance to be funded in 1963.

### PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation (to continue 1958 increases)..... | \$46, 329, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January).....                        | 44, 637, 000   |
| House allowance.....                                 | 44, 637, 000   |
| Committee recommendation.....                        | 44, 637, 000   |

The committee recommends striking the proviso requiring estimates of appropriations to reimburse the fund for the 1958 cost-of-living increases, in view of the conflict with pending legislation to make the increases permanent without the requirement for annual appropriations.

## ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

## EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

## (Limitation)

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 authorization-----       | None          |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | \$1, 148, 000 |
| House allowance-----          | 1, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 1, 148, 000   |

Restoration of \$148,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$1,148,000 for the limitation on administrative expenses from the employees' health benefits fund. The committee is advised that the amount is less than half of the 1 percent allowed by the law for administrative expenses.

## FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

## OPERATIONS

|                               |                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$388, 164, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 441, 000, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 428, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 440, 600, 000   |

Restoration of \$12,600,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$440,600,000 for operations, which is \$400,000 below the budget estimate. The committee is advised that without this restoration newly installed facilities could not be operated, the new field headquarters at Atlanta, Ga., could not be fully established, and many programs in the interest of safety would be retarded.

The committee further recommends deleting the proviso limiting the total costs of aviation medicine research to \$1,500,000 and 120 positions. The committee is advised that the amount of the limitation would hold the research program to the 1961 level, and that 150 positions are required, of which 120 positions will be at the Civil Aeromedical Research Institute.

In this connection the specialized laboratory building required to house the Civil Aeromedical Research Institute is being constructed by the Oklahoma City Airport Trust Authority, a nonprofit public authority, and leased by the FAA for 10 years. This arrangement has been previously used in connection with other buildings housing the aeronautical center in Oklahoma City, and is contemplated for use in acquiring necessary facilities at the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center at Atlantic City, N.J.

Under this arrangement buildings have been provided to FAA specifications at a construction cost substantially less than that of ordinary office space constructed in the area by the General Services Administration. The rental paid by the FAA, even including maintenance, is substantially below commercial rent even of ordinary office space in the same area. Not only does the arrangement avoid the necessity of large capital expenditures, but the committee agrees with the FAA Administrator that "We are getting this space cheaper than we could rent it elsewhere, or buy it, or build it and maintain it ourselves." While the widespread use of this arrangement might be subject to abuse, the committee is convinced that its continued use at the aeronautical center is in the public interest.

## FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

|                               |                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$164, 600, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 126, 000, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 120, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 124, 577, 000   |

The committee recommends restoration of \$4,577,000, to provide the budget estimate less \$1,000,000, except for \$423,000 requested for "radiological protection," which is disapproved by the committee in line with action on funds for other fallout shelters in the bill.

The committee further recommends deleting the provision denying funds for the construction of a new wind tunnel. The committee is advised that the Agency has not been able to find a suitable available tunnel which could be modified to meet their fire test needs; that of the few that would meet their requirements, they are needed by the agencies that own them for high priority work, or their modification to meet the requirements would cost more than a new wind tunnel.

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$64, 480, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 65, 000, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 60, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 60, 000, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$60 million for research and development, which is \$5 million below the budget estimate. Under "Operations" the committee has recommended the deletion of the proviso limiting the positions and funds for aviation medicine research.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----                         | \$3, 230, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January) consolidated item----- | 3, 425, 000   |
| House allowance-----                            | 3, 225, 000   |
| Committee recommendation-----                   | 3, 225, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$3,225,000 for operation and maintenance, which is \$200,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends inserting the authorization for the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for police-type use at \$300 over the general price limitation.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----                         | \$2, 450, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January) consolidated item----- | 2, 575, 000   |
| House allowance-----                            | 1, 975, 000   |
| Committee recommendation-----                   | 1, 975, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$1,975,000 for operation and maintenance, which is \$600,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends inserting the authorization for the purchase of three passenger motor vehicles.



### CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, ADDITIONAL WASHINGTON AIRPORT

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....                         | None          |
| Estimate, 1962 (January) consolidated item..... | \$8, 000, 000 |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 129.....                      | 20, 100, 000  |
| House allowance.....                            | 26, 100, 000  |
| Committee recommendation.....                   | 20, 100, 000  |

The committee recommends a reduction of \$6 million from the House allowance, to provide the full amount of the revised budget estimate of \$20,100,000 for additional construction requirements at the Dulles Airport, including \$4,597,000 for 10 small projects and \$15,503,000 for the added cost of contractor claims, inflationary factors, and underestimation of construction costs.

The committee echoes the disappointment of the House committee to learn of the slow progress being made in completing Dulles Airport, which now will not open until October 1962. The committee is reluctant to agree to \$6 million over the budget estimate, for a hangar or anything else, until there is some indication of an end to these constantly increasing costs. Approval of the amended budget estimate will bring the total appropriations to \$105 million.

To aid the committee in its consideration of the 1963 budget estimates, the committee requests the Comptroller General to prepare a comprehensive report, including any previous audits or inquiries that have been made, on the factors involved in increasing the costs of constructing Dulles International Airport, including reasons for the respective increases, reasons for the delays in construction, difficulties encountered affecting roads, drainage, sewage, and any other factors that may be helpful to the committee. The report should be made available to the Congress by March 31, 1962.

### CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | None           |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | None           |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 129.....    | \$12, 000, 000 |
| House allowance.....          | 10, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 12, 000, 000   |

Restoration of \$2 million is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$12 million requested in a revised budget estimate for a feasibility study of the development of a civil supersonic aircraft. The committee is advised that the necessary data cannot be developed for \$20 million, but that the cost of the feasibility study for the first 2 years will be nearer \$50 million.

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$13, 789, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 12, 525, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 12, 400, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 12, 525, 000   |

Restoration of \$125,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$12,525,000 for salaries and expenses. The committee is advised that the denial of even this small amount will create problems and pile up workloads without reducing any backlogs.

The committee recommends inserting a proviso extending to December 31, 1962, the limitation on the availability of the appropriation for a special ultra high frequency television study, as contained in the 1961 act.

The committee was advised of the need for supergrades in the Commission, and the committee hopes that the enactment of legislation now pending will serve to meet this requirement.

## FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 authorization.....       | \$2, 071, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 1, 725, 000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 168.....    | 1, 870, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 1, 725, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 1, 725, 000   |

### NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 authorization.....       | \$8, 819, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 10, 366, 000  |
| House allowance.....          | 10, 366, 000  |
| Committee recommendation..... | 10, 366, 000  |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$1,725,000 for the administrative expense limitation and \$10,366,000 for the non-administrative expense limitation for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The committee recommends adding the authorization to treat as nonadministrative expenses all necessary expenses relating to the preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 408 of the National Housing Act, relating to savings and loan holding companies. The committee is advised that this authorization is needed in order to provide funds to allow the Board to carry out its responsibilities under that section.

The committee went into some detail with the Board concerning the matter of "come-on" advertising offering gifts to those who open accounts with Federal savings and loan institutions and those insured under the Federal savings and loan insurance provisions. The committee recognizes that the Board has no jurisdiction over institutions not falling in the above categories. Typical examples of this type of advertising are shown in the hearings at pages 330 to 348. The committee feels that this practice has grown to alarming proportions in such a manner as to affect ultimately the sound policies which have enabled these institutions to contribute so much to home ownership and building. It therefore recommends strongly that the Board take proper steps by regulation to limit and curb such questionable practices.

## FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION

|                               |            |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| 1961 authorization.....       | \$857, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 890, 000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 168.....    | 990, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 890, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 890, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$890,000 for the administrative expense limitation of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

To conform with the recommendation for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the committee recommends adding the authorization to exclude from administrative expenses of the Corporation all necessary expenses relating to the preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 408 of the National Housing Act, relating to savings and loan holding companies.

## FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$8,163,500 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 8,793,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 8,793,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 8,793,000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of the full budget estimate of \$8,793,000 for salaries and expenses.

The committee was advised of the need for the upgrading of hearing examiners in the Commission, and the committee hopes that the enactment of legislation now pending will serve to meet this requirement.

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$8,009,500 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 9,640,000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 156.....    | 10,690,000  |
| House allowance.....          | 10,000,000  |
| Committee recommendation..... | 10,690,000  |

Restoration of \$690,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the amended budget estimate of \$10,690,000 for salaries and expenses. The committee is advised that \$420,000 of the restoration is required to prevent the elimination of 54 positions requested to handle the increasing volume and backlog of work in the regular programs of the Commission, and \$270,000 is required to prevent the elimination of 22 positions requested to handle the enforcement investigations recently requested by the Attorney General.

The committee is further advised that \$190,000 will be required for rental of additional office space, not only in Washington, but for the expansion of field office staffs, for which funds are recommended.

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

### OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$169,992,000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 176,000,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 170,000,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 176,000,000   |

Restoration of \$6 million is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$176 million for operating expenses. The committee is advised that the restoration is required to adequately staff new buildings, to pay increased rents on renewed leases, and to pay increased costs of utilities from expanded use of air conditioning and electronic computers.



The committee is further advised that various Government agencies now occupy 88,529,000 square feet of space, of which 64,955,000 square feet is Government owned, 22,305,000 square feet is leased and 1,269,000 square feet is lease-purchase. These figures represent an increase of 2,557,000 square feet over last year in Government-owned space, an increase of 229,000 square feet in lease-purchase space, and a decrease of 630,000 square feet in leased space. The committee is confident that as the space in Government owned buildings now being constructed increases, the leased space can be sharply reduced.

#### REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$58, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 60, 000, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 58, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 58, 000, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House in allowing \$58 million for repair and improvement of public buildings, which is \$2 million below the budget estimate, due to a denial of authority and funds for fallout shelters in connection with alterations to existing buildings. The committee is also denying other authority and funds requested in this bill for fallout shelters, until it has an opportunity to review the matter in connection with the pending reorganization of civil defense activities in the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The committee recommends adding to the category of "public buildings" for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration.

#### CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

|                               |                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$165, 441, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 181, 325, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 171, 600, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 194, 456, 500   |

The committee agrees to the projects included in the bill by the House, with the 5-percent reduction for anticipated savings on contracts and with the disallowance of funds for installing fallout shelters; and the committee recommends the following changes:

Adding the General Services Administration stores depot at Denver, Colo., at the reduced amount of \$5,510,000, in lieu of the estimate of \$5,795,000. Funds were not estimated for fallout shelters.

Deducting \$5,601,500, recommended in the proviso inserted in the bill to make available to this appropriation the funds appropriated in 1961 for a construction and alteration project at Philadelphia, Pa., since abandoned as to its previously approved scope. The committee is advised that bids were excessive and no award was made; the project was abandoned; and a new project has been approved for a larger and more adequate new building, on which construction funds will not be required until 1963.

In addition, the committee has selected from the priorities on the phasing of starts (shown in schedule E at p. 393 of the Senate hearings) four projects showing construction award capability in calendar year 1961. The committee recommends adding these projects at the

estimated improvement cost less amounts for fallout protection and less 5-percent savings, to conform to other projects in the bill, as follows:

|                              | Estimated<br>improve-<br>ment cost | Fallout<br>protection | 5-percent<br>savings<br>reduction | Amount<br>recom-<br>mended |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Tupelo, Miss., PO.....       | \$872,000                          | \$42,000              | \$41,000                          | \$789,000                  |
| Pittsburgh, Pa., FOB.....    | 21,858,000                         | 790,000               | 1,068,000                         | 20,000,000                 |
| Dyersburg, Tenn., PO.....    | 997,000                            | 48,000                | 48,000                            | 901,000                    |
| Montpelier, Vt., PO, CT..... | 1,386,000                          | 62,000                | 66,000                            | 1,258,000                  |
| Total.....                   |                                    |                       |                                   | 22,948,000                 |

These changes result in a net figure of \$194,456,500, the amount recommended by the committee for the construction appropriation, which is \$22,856,500 over the House figure and \$13,131,500 over the budget estimate.

The committee further recommends changing the designation of Long Beach area to Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, in order to allow flexibility of the site location in view of the possibility of obtaining a donated site.

The committee also recommends deleting "sites and expenses" from the limitation making \$500,000 of the construction funds available for small public buildings outside the District of Columbia. The committee is advised that these buildings can be financed from the "Sites and expenses" appropriation, without bookkeeping complications.

The projects recommended for construction, at locations and at maximum costs, are listed in the following table:

| Project location  | Amounts<br>provided in<br>House bill | Amounts<br>provided in<br>Senate bill |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Decatur, Ala., PO, FOB.....   | \$1,315,750                          | \$1,315,750                           |
| Los Angeles, Calif., CU, FOB.....   | 27,388,500                           | 27,388,500                            |
| Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, California, customs and appraisal<br>warehouse.....   | 2,000,000                            | 2,000,000                             |
| Denver, Colo., CT, FOB.....   | 18,145,000                           | 18,145,000                            |
| Denver, Colo., GSA stores depot.....  |                                      | 5,510,000                             |
| Statesboro, Ga., PO, etc.....   | 538,650                              | 538,650                               |
| Winder, Ga., PO, etc.....   | 475,000                              | 475,000                               |
| Wyandotte, Mich., PO, etc.....  | 402,800                              | 402,800                               |
| Santa Fe, N. Mex., PO, FOB.....   | 2,362,650                            | 2,362,650                             |
| New York, N.Y., CU, CT, FOB.....  | 59,222,050                           | 59,222,050                            |
| Bryson City, N.C., PO, CT.....  | 753,350                              | 753,350                               |
| Thomasville, N.C., PO.....  | 327,750                              | 327,750                               |
| Pembina, N. Dak., BS.....   | 183,350                              | 183,350                               |
| Cincinnati, Ohio, FOB.....  | 17,432,500                           | 17,432,500                            |
| Medford, Oreg., PO, etc.....  | 1,728,050                            | 1,728,050                             |
| Johnstown, Pa., PO, etc.....  | 1,187,500                            | 1,187,500                             |
| Lebanon, Pa., PO, etc.....  | 730,550                              | 730,550                               |
| Derby Line, Vt., BS.....  | 267,900                              | 267,900                               |
| GPO field plant, District of Columbia.....  | 1,545,650                            | 1,545,650                             |
| FOB No. 8, District of Columbia (increase).....   | 3,800,000                            | 3,800,000                             |
| Chicago, Ill., CT, FOB (increase).....  | 31,293,000                           | 31,293,000                            |
| Small projects outside District of Columbia.....  | 500,000                              | 500,000                               |
| Total.....  | 171,600,000                          | 177,110,000                           |
| Deduct: Funds appropriated in 1961 annual act for construction and altera-<br>tion project at Philadelphia, Pa., now superseded by a larger and more<br>adequate new building project, to aid in financing the projects listed above..... |                                      | -5,601,500                            |
| Total.....  |                                      | 171,508,500                           |
| New projects added by Senate:   |                                      |                                       |
| Tupelo, Miss., PO.....  |                                      | 789,000                               |
| Pittsburgh, Pa., FOB.....   |                                      | 20,000,000                            |
| Dyersburg, Tenn., PO.....   |                                      | 901,000                               |
| Montpelier, Vt., PO, CT.....  |                                      | 1,258,000                             |
| Senate, total.....  |                                      | 194,456,500                           |

## SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----  | \$21, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)-----  | 5, 000, 000    |
| House allowance (reported at \$25,000,000; item stricken on point of order)----- | None           |
| Committee recommendation-----  | 25, 000, 000   |

Restoration is recommended by the committee of the entire item for "Sites and expenses, public buildings projects," which was stricken in the House on a point of order. Since that time the projects have been approved by the Public Works Committees.

The committee recommends the amount of \$25 million, the same amount as reported by the House committee, for sites and expenses for additional projects. The projects approved at this time are listed in the following table:

*GSA public buildings construction projects approved by congressional Public Works Committees during 87th Cong. under sec. 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959*

[Dollars in thousands]

|  | Estimated cost |                       |                       | Date approved |               |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|
|  | Total          | Improve-<br>ment cost | Sites and<br>expenses | House         | Senate        |
| California:                                    |                |                       |                       |               |               |
| Calexico, BPS-----                             | \$375          | \$319                 | \$56                  | June 14, 1961 | June 26, 1961 |
| Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area,<br>CU----- | 3, 250         | 2, 240                | 1, 010                | do-----       | Do.           |
| Florida:                                       |                |                       |                       |               |               |
| Jacksonville, FOB-----                         | 9, 573         | 7, 815                | 1, 758                | do-----       | Do.           |
| Marianna, PO CT-----                           | 633            | 546                   | 87                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| St. Petersburg, FOB-----                       | 5, 325         | 4, 403                | 922                   | do-----       | Do.           |
| Georgia: Macon, PO FOB-----                    | 4, 334         | 3, 532                | 802                   | Apr. 18, 1961 | May 23, 1961  |
| Idaho: Porthill, BS-----                       | 152            | 128                   | 24                    | June 14, 1961 | June 26, 1961 |
| Iowa: Des Moines, FOB-----                     | 10, 335        | 9, 002                | 1, 333                | do-----       | Aug. 16, 1960 |
| Kentucky:                                      |                |                       |                       |               |               |
| Louisville, FOB-----                           | 13, 100        | 11, 202               | 1, 898                | do-----       | June 26, 1961 |
| Louisville, PO CT CU-----                      | 1, 209         | 1, 095                | 114                   | do-----       | Do.           |
| Owensboro, PO CT-----                          | 337            | 295                   | 42                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| Louisiana:                                     |                |                       |                       |               |               |
| New Orleans, PO CT-----                        | 3, 872         | 3, 629                | 243                   | do-----       | Do.           |
| New Orleans, FOB-----                          | 1, 415         | 1, 290                | 125                   | do-----       | Do.           |
| Maine: Houlton, BP sec. Hq-----                | 410            | 352                   | 58                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| Michigan:                                      |                |                       |                       |               |               |
| Detroit, PO CT-----                            | 4, 628         | 4, 315                | 313                   | do-----       | Do.           |
| Grand Rapids, PO CT-----                       | 831            | 737                   | 94                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| Sault Ste. Marie, BS-----                      | 312            | 270                   | 42                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| Minnesota:                                     |                |                       |                       |               |               |
| Pigcon River, BS-----                          | 351            | 310                   | 41                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| St. Paul, CT FOB-----                          | 11, 673        | 10, 120               | 1, 553                | do-----       | Do.           |
| Nebraska: Grand Island, PO CT-----             | 364            | 322                   | 42                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| New Hampshire: Concord, PO CT-----             | 4, 036         | 3, 520                | 516                   | do-----       | June 26, 1960 |
| North Carolina: Fayetteville, PO CT-----       | 2, 690         | 2, 235                | 455                   | do-----       | Aug. 16, 1960 |
| North Dakota: Grand Forks, PO CT-----          | 370            | 325                   | 45                    | do-----       | June 26, 1961 |
| Oklahoma: Oklahoma City, PO CT-----            | 879            | 794                   | 85                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| Pennsylvania:                                  |                |                       |                       |               |               |
| Harrisburg, CT FOB-----                        | 7, 470         | 7, 005                | 465                   | do-----       | Do.           |
| Philadelphia, CT FOB-----                      | 42, 680        | 40, 380               | 2, 300                | do-----       | Do.           |
| Texas:   |                |                       |                       |               |               |
| Del Rio, BP sec. Hq-----                       | 535            | 483                   | 52                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| Del Rio, BS-----                               | 342            | 300                   | 42                    | do-----       | Do.           |
| Fort Worth, FOB-----                           | 20, 600        | 16, 623               | 3, 977                | do-----       | Aug. 16, 1961 |
| Houston, PO CT-----                            | 1, 518         | 1, 393                | 125                   | do-----       | June 26, 1961 |
| Virginia: Charlottesville, HEW building-----   | 2, 333         | 2, 171                | 162                   | do-----       | Do.           |
| Washington: Spokane, CT FOB-----               | 8, 694         | 7, 212                | 1, 482                | do-----       | Do.           |
| District of Columbia: FOB No. 5-----           | 42, 000        | 38, 200               | 3, 800                | do-----       | Do.           |
| Total (33 projects)-----                       | 206, 626       | 182, 563              | 24, 063               | -----         | -----         |



## OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation (plus receipts, \$3,243,500)-----       | \$4, 422, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January) (plus receipts, \$3,935,000)----- | 3, 737, 000   |
| House allowance (plus receipts, \$3,935,000)-----          | 3, 450, 000   |
| Committee recommendation (plus receipts, \$3,935,000)----- | 3, 737, 000   |

Restoration is recommended by the committee of \$287,000, to provide the budget estimate of \$3,737,000 for operating expenses. The committee is advised that the restoration is required in order to permit full participation in a procurement program with the Department of Defense to eliminate duplicative items.

## EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$24, 425, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 27, 574, 000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 129-----    | 29, 374, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 27, 375, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 29, 374, 000   |

Restoration is recommended by the committee of \$1,999,000, to provide the budget estimate of \$29,374,000 for expenses of supply distribution. The committee is advised that the volume of sales has increased beyond the volume used as a basis for the 1962 estimate of appropriations.

## GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation--- -----   | \$20, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 8, 000, 000    |
| House allowance-----          | 4, 000, 000    |
| Committee recommendation----- | 8, 000, 000    |

Restoration of \$4 million is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$8 million for the capital of the general supply fund. The committee is advised that this additional capital is required due to the increase in sales volume.

## OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC UTILITIES SERVICE

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$2, 536, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 2, 500, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 2, 475, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 2, 175, 000   |

A reduction of \$300,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$2,175,000 for operating expenses, which is \$325,000 below the budget estimate.

In the 1961 appropriations bill, the committee promised that it would explore fully criticisms relative to the General Services Administration's intervention in regulatory matters. The committee has investigated the matter and a full morning was given over to this subject.

Those objecting to these activities have claimed that GSA's intervention activities in rate proceedings unnecessarily duplicate the functions and responsibilities of the established regulatory agencies, prolonging the proceedings, and interfering with the regulatory policies imposed by Congress and the various State legislatures.

GSA's obligation to participate in major transportation and utility regulatory proceedings is not disputed. It is accepted that they should appear as necessary to represent the interests of the Government as a user and insure that the rates and services provided are reasonable and fair as they apply to the Government, in comparison with rates charged other users. What is disputed is participation in these proceedings for the presentation of evidence and argument covering broad matters of regulatory policy such as valuation, rate of return, and other subjects related to overall regulatory policy of the various commissions.

This latter activity by GSA has been declared to be unnecessary by the heads of the various Federal regulatory agencies as well as by the National Association of Railroad & Utilities Commissioners, representing the State regulatory commissions.

GSA officials admit that their presentations do duplicate that submitted by the regulatory agency and other intervenors. They argued that this duplication is necessary in order for them to discharge their obligation under existing law (the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act). With this position, the committee disagrees.

The committee is of the opinion that GSA presentations on basic matters of regulatory policy represent a dual responsibility of the regulatory agencies and unnecessarily duplicate the functions assigned by Congress and the State legislatures to the regulatory commissions. It would seem an unusual situation where the regulatory staffs are incompetent or unable to develop the information necessary to a proper determination of these issues for the general public interest. Personnel of such agencies are peculiarly competent by long training to develop and present facts necessary to a proper determination of the public interest.

GSA is able to make a significant showing of savings to the Government in connection with their study and evaluation of specific rates for services which the government purchases in large volume. Their negotiations with the individual carriers have produced noteworthy economies and efficiencies. It is the view of the committee that the efforts of GSA should be confined to this area.

The House Appropriations Committee in its report accompanying GSA's 1962 appropriation reduced the agency's appropriation below its request for 1962. The Senate committee has cut the request of GSA and it is intended that this cut be applied to the reduction of these activities in accordance with this report. To effect this, the committee has placed the following limitation in the bill:

No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies.

This prohibition will still permit GSA to appear before the regulatory bodies and insure that the Federal Government is afforded adequate services at nondiscriminatory rates and that they bear a fair and reasonable relationship to rates charged other users for comparable services.



## STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | \$26, 235, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 40, 000, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 30, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 40, 000, 000   |

The committee recommends restoration of \$10 million, to provide the budget estimate of \$40 million for strategic and critical materials: Of this restoration, \$8,683,000 is to provide the amount of \$16,667,000 for the rotation of the cordage fibers, abaca and sisal, which the committee is advised cannot be delayed without impairing the quality of the stockpile.

For upgrading materials, the committee recommends the balance of the restoration, amounting to \$1,317,000. The budget stated that stockpiled materials are upgraded to more usable forms in order to provide a minimum readiness inventory of materials in forms suitable for immediate use to meet the initial surge of demand and abnormal conditions of intensive mobilization, but reduced the estimates for such program from \$5,291,000 for 1961 to \$400,000 for 1962, by providing only for transportation and handling costs, and a plan to arrange with contractors for payment in materials that are excess in the national stockpile or the DPA inventory, without expenditure of stockpile funds.

A proviso was requested to authorize such plan. The committee recommends deletion of this proviso. The committee is advised that there is uncertainty as to what materials could be transferred, and the committee is also advised that small plants may require the payments to include some funds as well as the materials.

The committee believes that savings could be effected through the upgrading of chrome and manganese into a more usable form than to allow the concentrates to waste away by wind and rain action.

The committee also recommends the deletion of "provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government" from the proviso authorizing the acquiring of leasehold interests for storage, security, and maintenance of materials.

## ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND (LIMITATION)

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 authorization-----       | \$14, 113, 200 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | 14, 607, 000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 129-----    | 14, 864, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 14, 268, 900   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 14, 864, 000   |

Restoration of \$595,100 is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$14,864,000 for the limitation on the administrative operations fund. This is in conformity with recommendations made on other items in the Administration.

## WORKING CAPITAL FUND

|                               |            |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----       | None       |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)----- | \$150, 000 |
| House allowance-----          | None       |
| Committee recommendation----- | 150, 000   |

The committee recommends inserting the item for the working capital fund, which was denied by the House, in the amount of



\$150,000, as estimated. The committee is advised that these funds are required to obtain printing presses, papercutters, and other equipment, as authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, at the printing plants established in 1959 at Boston, Mass., Atlanta, Ga., Kansas City, Mo., and Dallas, Tex.

### GENERAL PROVISIONS, GSA

The committee recommends restoration of the general provision allowing a 2-percent transfer between appropriations for operating expenses in the Administration, at not to exceed \$2 million. This provision has been carried in the acts for four previous fiscal years, and allows the Administrator a limited flexibility to meet unavoidable workloads.

The 1961 Independent Offices Appropriation Act contained the following general provision for GSA:

In disposing of surplus real estate and buildings a reasonable period of time shall be allowed for local governmental units to effect a comprehensive and coordinated plan of use and procurement.

The committee is satisfied that the procedure for notifying public agencies, as contained in the GSA brochure "Disposal of Surplus Real Property, for Public Use, for Private Use" will be adequately followed. Accordingly, at the request of the General Services Administration, the committee has determined that the 1961 general provision shall no longer be effective.

## HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$11,015,000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 12,400,000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 157.....    | 13,150,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 12,900,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 12,900,000   |

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$12,900,000 for salaries and expenses which is \$250,000 below the budget estimate. The committee believes that the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program, which brings in private money, should not be deemphasized in any way.

The committee does not agree with the House in adding to the proviso authorizing the collection of fees for expenses of inspections, the urban planning, and reserve of planned public works programs, and recommends the deletion of such authorization. The committee is advised that physical projects are not involved in either instance and that audits on the advances are very rare, with small expense, and would not justify the burden of administering a system of fixed fees.

## PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

|                               |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$6,000,000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 4,000,000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 157.....    | 8,000,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 6,000,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 8,000,000   |

Restoration of \$2 million is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$8 million for the public works planning fund. The committee is advised that the activity in the program has exceeded the rate contemplated in the revised budget estimate, and any reduction would involve a restriction of the program.

## URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

|                               |           |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | None      |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | None      |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 157.....    | \$900,000 |
| House allowance.....          | 450,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | None      |

The committee recommends the deletion of the item for urban studies and housing research.

The committee does feel that studies on housing for the elderly should continue, but such studies by this Agency should await the completion of the investigation now being conducted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, after which the committee would be in a position to consider the funds needed for that purpose.

## HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$20,000,000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | None         |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 157.....    | 30,000,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 25,000,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 25,000,000   |

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$25 million for the Housing for the Elderly Fund and \$350,000 for the administrative expense limitation.

The Housing Act of 1961 authorizes \$75 million additional and makes liberalizing changes in the law, which will most likely require a supplemental estimate. The committee prefers to defer the recommendation of further funds in this program until the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill.

## PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

## ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$13,868,000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 14,150,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 13,968,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 13,968,000   |

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$13,968,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, which is \$182,000 below the budget estimate.

## COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

## ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 authorization.....       | \$1, 580, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 1, 950, 000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 157.....    | 2, 100, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 1, 900, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 2, 100, 000   |

The committee recommends restoration of \$200,000, to provide the budget estimate of \$2,100,000 for the administrative expense limitation for college housing loans. The committee is advised that without this restoration the Agency would be required to reduce the staff at a time of increased activity in the program.

## PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

## ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION

|                               |            |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| 1961 authorization.....       | \$537, 500 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 600, 000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 157.....    | 750, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 650, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 750, 000   |

Restoration of \$100,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$750,000 for the administrative expense limitation for public facility loans. The committee is advised that the restoration is required in order to meet the budgeted workload without lengthening processing time or reducing the level of services rendered.

## FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

## ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 authorization.....       | \$9, 011, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 9, 675, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 9, 600, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 9, 600, 000   |

## NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 authorization.....       | \$52, 988, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962.....           | 62, 300, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 58, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 61, 300, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$9,600,000 for the administrative expense limitation, which is \$75,000 below the budget estimate.

Restoration is recommended by the committee of \$3,300,000, to provide a total amount of \$61,300,000 for the nonadministrative expense limitation for the Federal Housing Administration, which is \$1 million below the budget estimate. The committee is advised that the workload estimates have been changed due to a sharp increase in default servicing and an increase in applications for mortgage insurance, with a decrease in applications for new homes, but that the amount recommended is the minimum required for prompt and efficient processing.

The committee further recommends adding a proviso that the nonadministrative expense limitation shall not apply to fees and



other expenses paid by and between private parties in connection with cases processed under the certified agency program. The committee is advised that the limitation is unworkable as to this program, since the appraisal fees cannot be ascertained until after the transaction, and any attempt to conform to the limitation would create a substantial and unproductive workload. The committee is assured that the proviso recommended will not disturb the budgetary control over fee appraisers in ordinary FHA operations.

## INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$21, 451, 500 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 22, 200, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 21, 950, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 22, 200, 000   |

Restoration of \$250,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$22,200,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission. The committee is advised that the restoration is required in order to meet increased workloads.

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends a total appropriation amount of \$1,749 million, being distributed into the items of "Salaries and expenses," "Research and development," and "Construction of facilities" as herein indicated. The amount of \$549 million, requested in House Document No. 179, is added to the House allowance of \$1,200 million, and the total amount recommended is \$35,300,000 below the total budget estimate, as amended, of \$1,784,300,000.

The committee feels that there is a demonstrated need for the speeding up of advanced programs with immediate objectives of manned orbital space vehicles which will relate themselves to weather observations and forecasting, communications, intelligence, and military defense. Such programs may well lead ultimately to interplanetary exploration. The committee believes that such objectives are an immediate necessity, in order to keep abreast of world developments and ahead in the overall scientific capability and knowledge of the world.

What we are dealing with is the whole technological future of our country in the aeronautical and space sciences.

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                                    |                 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....            | \$170, 760, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962:                    |                 |
| (January).....                     | \$189, 986, 000 |
| (March addition, H. Doc. 125)..... | 6, 700, 000     |
| (May addition, H. Doc. 179).....   | 30, 000, 000    |
|                                    | <hr/>           |
| House allowance.....               | 226, 686, 000   |
| Committee recommendation.....      | 191, 750, 000   |
|                                    | 221, 750, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$191,750,000, which is \$4,936,000 below the budget estimate as amended in March by House Document No. 125 in the amount of \$196,686,000 for salaries and expenses.

The committee recommends adding \$30 million, requested in May in House Document No. 179, in line with the national goals set by the President in his special message of May 25, 1961, to provide additional personnel for research and development work on launch vehicles and spacecraft for manned orbital landings and intermediate manned space missions, for acceleration of work on meteorological and communications satellite systems, and for strengthening technical and administrative management and execution of development programs. These programs have now been authorized by Public Law No. 87-98, approved July 21, 1961.

The committee further recommends increasing the limitation for expenses of travel from \$8 million to \$10,395,000.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----                   | \$670, 453, 000  |
| Estimate, 1962: -                         |                  |
| (January)-----                            | \$819, 819, 000  |
| (March addition, H. Doc. 125)-----        | 99, 720, 000     |
| (May addition, H. Doc. 179)-----          | 376, 000, 000    |
|   | <hr/>            |
| (H.R. 6874 authorizes \$1, 305, 539, 000) | 1, 295, 539, 000 |
| House allowance-----                      | 892, 000, 000    |
| Committee recommendation-----             | 1, 278, 000, 000 |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$892 million, which is \$27,539,000 below the budget estimate as amended in March by House Document No. 125 in the amount of \$919,539,000 for research and development.

The committee recommends adding \$386 million, consisting of the amount of \$376 million in the budget estimate as amended in May, and \$10 million as additionally authorized in H.R. 6874. House Document No. 179 requested in May, in line with the national goals set by the President in his special message of May 25, 1961, budget amendments to provide for development of the spacecraft, launch vehicles, and supporting technology required for manned orbital landings and intermediate manned space flight missions; for initiating the development of a very large liquid propellant launch vehicle of the NOVA class needed for manned orbital flight (for comparison with development of a solid propellant NOVA class booster to be initiated by the Air Force); and for augmenting the program of unmanned exploration prior to manned orbital flights, accelerating development of meteorological and communications satellite systems, adding scientific investigations in space-by-earth satellites and sounding rockets, and initiating development of a flight-type nuclear rocket engine in the ROVER program (with related nuclear reaction development provided by the Atomic Energy Commission from available funds). These programs have now been authorized by Public Law No. 87-98, approved July 21, 1961, and in addition \$7,100,000 is authorized for further research on solid and semisolid fuels and \$2,900,000 for electrical propulsion, both considered vital to the furtherance of the national space program.

## CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

|                                      |                 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....              | \$122, 787, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962:                      |                 |
| (January).....                       | \$99, 825, 000  |
| (March addition, H. Doc. 125).....   | 19, 250, 000    |
| (May addition, H. Doc. 179).....     | 143, 000, 000   |
|                                      | <hr/>           |
|                                      | 262, 075, 000   |
| (H.R. 6874 authorizes \$252,075,000) |                 |
| House allowance.....                 | 116, 250, 000   |
| Committee recommendation.....        | 249, 250, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$116,250,000, which is \$2,825,000 below the budget estimate as amended in March by House Document No. 125 in the amount of \$119,075,000 for construction of facilities.

The committee recommends adding \$133 million, which is \$10 million less than the amount of \$143 million, requested in May in House Document No. 179, in line with the national goals set by the President in his special message of May 25, 1961, to provide initial increments of the research, development, test, and support facilities needed in the manned space flight and related vehicle development program and of the ground test facilities for the ROVER nuclear rocket flight-type engine. These programs have now been authorized by Public Law No. 87-98, approved July 21, 1961, which also reduced by \$10 million the general authorization for facilities at various locations, to allow for an increase in that amount for research and development within the total amount requested for 1962.

The committee further recommends deletion of the provision earmarking \$20 million for emergency construction of facilities. The committee is advised that such provision is in conflict with the transfer provision of the authorization.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee recommends that the limitation on the amount available for scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense be increased from \$15,000 to \$20,000, as estimated.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

## OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

|                               |           |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$40, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 40, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 40, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 0         |

The committee again recommends deleting this item from the bill, in the amount of \$40,000, thus permitting the Authority to operate as provided under the Housing Act of 1950, with budgets approved by the Public Housing Administration.



## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....   | \$175, 800, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January) (plus \$2,000,000 special foreign currency program).....         | 210, 000, 000   |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 129.....  | 275, 000, 000   |
| House allowance (including special foreign currency program at \$1,600,000).....          | 250, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation (including special foreign currency program at \$2,000,000)..... | 276, 500, 000   |

Restoration is recommended by the committee of \$26,500,000, to provide the budget estimate, including the special foreign currency program, less \$500,000. The exception refers to the public understanding of science under the support of scientific manpower program, budgeted at \$1 million, which the committee feels should be limited to the House allowance of \$500,000.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$5,400,000, to provide the revised estimate of \$32,200,000 for the minimum amount available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers.

The committee further recommends an increase of \$400,000, to provide the budget estimate of \$2 million for funds to purchase foreign currencies in the special foreign currency program.

## RENEGOTIATION BOARD

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$3, 015, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 3, 000, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 2, 900, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 2, 900, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$2,900,000 for salaries and expenses, which is \$100,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends inserting an authorization for expenses of travel at not to exceed \$45,000, which will anticipate a similar request in House Document No. 210, relating to the supplemental appropriation bill. The committee is advised that the increase is to permit an adequate liaison program with field establishments and essential inspections of industrial plants.

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$9, 517, 500 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 10, 915, 000  |
| (Amended) H. Doc. 162.....    | 11, 015, 000  |
| House allowance.....          | 11, 000, 000  |
| Committee recommendation..... | 11, 000, 000  |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$11 million for salaries and expenses, which is \$15,000 below the budget estimate.

Adding an authorization is recommended by the committee for the services of consultants at not to exceed \$100 per diem.

The committee was advised of the need for supergrades in the Commission, and the committee hopes that the enactment of legislation now pending will serve to meet this requirement.

## VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

### GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....       | \$164,350,000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)..... | 162,046,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 161,500,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 162,046,000   |

Restoration of \$546,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the budget estimate of \$162,046,000 for general operating expenses. The committee is advised that the restoration is required due to unanticipated increases in loan guarantee workloads and automatic data-processing conversion delays, and would require a reduction of 85 positions in planned employment.

### MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| 1961 appropriation.....                               | \$35,165,000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January) (less medical research)..... | 15,053,000   |
| House allowance (with medical research).....          | 40,700,000   |
| Committee recommendation.....                         | 47,053,000   |

### EARMARKED FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

(Of which \$1,000,000 is for prosthetics)

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| 1961 proviso.....                        | \$21,500,000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (under medical care)..... | 22,000,000   |
| House allowance.....                     | 27,000,000   |
| Committee recommendation.....            | 32,000,000   |

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$47,053,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses. Of this amount, the budget estimate of \$15,053,000 is recommended for other than medical research, and \$32 million is recommended for medical research, which is \$10 million over the budget estimate.

The committee is advised that the restoration of \$1,353,000 is required in the regular VA medical programs due to increased workloads, as well as in the dissemination of the knowledge gained through medical research in the education and training program.

Results obtained in medical research in the Veterans' Administration convince the committee that further efforts should be made, particularly in the fields of cancer, heart disease, mental illness, aging, neurology, and cooperative studies.

## CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 1961 appropriation-----                         | \$75, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1962 (January)-----                   | 75, 000, 000   |
| House allowance (reported at \$70,000,000)----- | 75, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation-----                   | 77, 500, 000   |

The committee recommends an addition of \$2,500,000, to be used for the construction, alteration, and improvement of medical research facilities, to conform to the recommendation of additional funds for medical research under the item for "Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses." The total amount for the construction item is \$77,500,000.

## LOAN GUARANTEE REVOLVING FUND

(TRANSFER FROM DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS AND RESERVES  
REVOLVING FUND)

The committee recommends the deletion of the amount limitation of \$120,624,000 from the fund. The committee is advised that expenditures from the fund are principally for loan guarantee claims and property acquisitions, which are not subject to administrative control, and the limitation might prevent the payment of claims.

The law, Public Law 86-665, approved July 14, 1960, established a revolving fund known as the Veterans' Administration loan guaranty revolving fund. Accordingly, the committee recommends perfecting amendments to change "guarantee" to "guaranty" when reference is made to the fund.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Section 102 of the general provisions for independent offices limits expenditures for travel expenses of employees, without specific limitation, to the amounts stated in the budget estimates, and exceptions have been made for the uncompensated boards of the Selective Service System and for investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The committee recommends, in view of the complications resulting from the new object classification of "Travel and transportation of persons," adding the following, at the request of the General Services Administration:

or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules.



## PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

| Item   | Appropriation<br>estimate, 1961 | Budget esti-<br>mate, 1962 | Increase (+) or<br>decrease (-) |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act.....                              | \$67,000                        | \$57,000                   | -\$10,000                       |
| General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property..... | 2,000,000                       | 2,000,000                  | -----                           |
| Veterans' Administration: Veterans insurance and indemnities.....                                      | 650,000                         | 655,000                    | +5,000                          |
| Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations.....  | 2,717,000                       | 2,712,000                  | -5,000                          |

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1961 budget document for 1962. Some of items subject to further revision.

## ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

| Corporation or agency  | Authorization,<br>1961 | Budget esti-<br>mates, 1962 | Recommended<br>in House bill | Amount rec-<br>ommended by<br>Senate com-<br>mittee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate<br>bill compared with— |                            |                |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|----------------|
|  |                        |                             |                              |   | Authoriza-<br>tions, 1961                                   | Budget esti-<br>mate, 1962 | House bill     |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board:                                  |                        |                             |                              |   |   |                            |                |
| Administrative expenses.....                                   | (\$2,071,000)          | (\$1,725,000)               | (\$1,725,000)                | (\$1,725,000)                                       | (-\$346,000)  | -----                      | -----          |
| Nonadministrative expenses.....                                | (8,819,000)            | (10,866,000)                | (10,866,000)                 | (10,866,000)  | (+1,547,000)  | -----                      | -----          |
| Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.....            | (857,000)              | (890,000)                   | (890,000)                    | (890,000)   | (+33,000)   | -----                      | -----          |
| General Services Administration:                               |                        |                             |                              |   |   |                            |                |
| Federal Facilities Corporation.....                            | (30,000)               | -----                       | -----                        | -----   | (-20,000)   | -----                      | -----          |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund.....       | (43,000)               | (42,500)                    | (42,500)                     | (42,500)  | (-500)  | -----                      | -----          |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency:                               |                        |                             |                              |   |   |                            |                |
| College housing loans.....                                     | (1,580,000)            | <sup>1</sup> (2,100,000)    | (1,900,000)                  | (2,100,000)   | (+520,000)  | -----                      | (+\$200,000)   |
| Public facility loans.....                                     | (537,500)              | <sup>1</sup> (750,000)      | (650,000)                    | (750,000)   | (+212,500)  | -----                      | (+100,000)     |
| Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....                     | (148,500)              | (150,000)                   | (145,000)                    | (145,000)   | (-2,500)  | (-\$5,000)                 | -----          |
| Federal National Mortgage Association.....                     | (6,900,000)            | (7,450,000)                 | (7,400,000)                  | (7,400,000)   | (+500,000)  | (-50,000)                  | -----          |
| Federal Housing Administration:                                |                        |                             |                              |   |   |                            |                |
| Administrative expenses.....                                   | (9,011,000)            | (9,675,000)                 | (9,600,000)                  | (9,600,000)   | (+539,000)  | (-75,000)                  | -----          |
| Nonadministrative expenses.....                                | (52,982,000)           | (62,800,000)                | (63,000,000)                 | (61,900,000)  | (+8,912,000)  | (-1,000,000)               | (+\$3,900,000) |
| Public Housing Administration:                                 |                        |                             |                              |   |   |                            |                |
| Administrative expenses.....                                   | (13,868,000)           | (14,150,000)                | (13,968,000)                 | (13,968,000)  | (+100,000)  | (-182,000)                 | -----          |
| Nonadministrative expenses.....                                | (1,200,000)            | (1,200,000)                 | (1,200,000)                  | (1,200,000)   | -----   | -----                      | -----          |
| Total, administrative and nonadministrative ex-<br>penses..... | (98,043,000)           | (110,798,500)               | (105,886,500)                | (109,486,500)                                       | (+11,443,500)   | (-1,912,000)               | (+\$3,600,000) |

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$150,000 contained in H. Doc. 157.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1961 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED  
IN THE BILL FOR 1962**

| Item  | Appropriations, 1961<br>(to date) | Budget estimates, 1962 | Recommended in House bill for 1962 | Amount recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with— |                        |              |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|--------------|
|   |                                   |                        |                                    |  | Appropriations, 1961                                     | Budget estimates, 1962 | House bill   |
| TITLE I   |                                   |                        |                                    |  |  |                        |              |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT   |                                   |                        |                                    |  |  |                        |              |
| National Aeronautics and Space Council.....                               |                                   | \$ 320,000             | \$320,000                          | \$320,000                              | +\$320,000   |                        |              |
| OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION                                  |                                   |                        |                                    |  |  |                        |              |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | \$25,346,000                      | 30,500,000             | 25,000,000                         | 25,000,000                             | -346,000   | -\$5,500,000           |              |
| Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies..... | 6,567,000                         | 8,700,000              | 6,567,000                          | 5,000,000                              | -1,567,000   | -3,700,000             | -\$1,567,000 |
| Federal contributions.....  | 16,000,000                        | 22,000,000             | 22,000,000                         | 22,000,000                             | +6,000,000   |                        |              |
| Emergency supplies and equipment.....                                     | 9,175,000                         | 36,000,000             | 21,600,000                         | 38,500,000                             | +29,325,000  | +2,500,000             | +16,900,000  |
| Research and development.....   | 4,000,000                         | 4,500,000              | 1,500,000                          | 2,500,000                              | -1,500,000   | -2,000,000             | +1,000,000   |
| Construction of facilities.....   |                                   | 2,500,000              | 2,500,000                          | 2,500,000                              | +2,500,000   |                        |              |
| Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....                      | 61,088,000                        | 104,200,000            | 79,167,000                         | 95,500,000                             | +34,412,000  | -8,700,000             | +16,333,000  |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT                                       |                                   |                        |                                    |  |  |                        |              |
| Disaster relief.....  |                                   | 6,000,000              | 6,000,000                          | 6,000,000                              | +6,000,000   |                        |              |
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD   |                                   |                        |                                    |  |  |                        |              |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | 7,852,500                         | 9,050,000              | 8,900,000                          | 8,900,000                              | +1,047,500   | -150,000               |              |
| Payments to air carriers.....   | 82,500,000                        | 81,700,000             | 74,800,000                         | 81,700,000                             | -800,000   |                        | +6,900,000   |
| Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....                                       | 90,352,500                        | 90,750,000             | 83,700,000                         | 90,600,000                             | +247,500   | -150,000               | +6,900,000   |



| CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  |             |             |             |             |              |            |             |  |  |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------|--|--|
| Salaries and expenses.....  | 20,761,000  | 21,829,000  | 31,029,000  | 21,669,000  | +303,000     | -160,000   | +640,000    |  |  |
| Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations..... | 462,000     | 438,000     | 430,000     | 430,000     | -32,000      | -8,000     |             |  |  |
| Annuities under special acts.....   | 2,316,000   | 2,248,000   | 2,248,000   | 2,248,000   | -68,000      |            |             |  |  |
| Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund.....            | 2,500,000   | 5,450,000   | 4,500,000   | 4,500,000   | +2,000,000   | -950,000   |             |  |  |
| Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund.....              | 1,625,000   | 20,900,000  | 19,000,000  | 19,000,000  | +17,375,000  | -1,900,000 |             |  |  |
| Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.....                      | 46,329,000  | 44,637,000  | 44,637,000  | 44,637,000  | -1,692,000   |            |             |  |  |
| Administrative expenses, employees health benefits fund (limitation).....         |             | (1,148,000) | (1,000,000) | (1,148,000) | (+1,148,000) |            | (+148,000)  |  |  |
| Administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund (limitation).....          | (360,000)   | (262,000)   | (260,000)   | (260,000)   |              | (-2,000)   |             |  |  |
| Total, Civil Service Commission.....  | 73,993,000  | 95,502,000  | 91,844,000  | 92,484,000  | +18,491,000  | -3,018,000 | +640,000    |  |  |
| FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY   |             |             |             |             |              |            |             |  |  |
| Operations.....   | 388,164,000 | 441,000,000 | 428,000,000 | 440,600,000 | +62,436,000  | -400,000   | +12,600,000 |  |  |
| Facilities and equipment.....   | 164,600,000 | 126,000,000 | 120,000,000 | 124,577,000 | -40,023,000  | -1,423,000 | +4,577,000  |  |  |
| Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization).....           | 80,000,000  | 70,000,000  | 70,000,000  | 70,000,000  | -10,000,000  |            |             |  |  |
| Research and development.....   | 64,480,000  | 65,000,000  | 60,000,000  | 60,000,000  | -4,480,000   | -5,000,000 |             |  |  |
| Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports.....                         |             | 6,000,000   |             |             |              | -6,000,000 |             |  |  |
| Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport.....                       | 3,230,000   |             | 3,225,000   | 3,225,000   | -5,000       | +3,225,000 |             |  |  |
| Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport.....                      | 2,450,000   |             | 1,975,000   | 1,975,000   | -475,000     | +1,975,000 |             |  |  |
| Construction, Washington National Airport.....                                    | 4,500,000   | 4,200,000   | 4,200,000   | 4,200,000   | -300,000     |            |             |  |  |
| Construction and development, additional Washington Airport.....                  |             | 20,100,000  | 26,100,000  | 20,100,000  | +20,100,000  |            | -6,000,000  |  |  |
| Civil supersonic aircraft development.....  |             | 412,000,000 | 10,000,000  | 12,000,000  | +12,000,000  |            | +2,000,000  |  |  |
| Total, Federal Aviation Agency.....   | 707,424,000 | 744,300,000 | 723,500,000 | 736,677,000 | +29,253,000  | -7,623,000 | +13,177,000 |  |  |

Doc. 129.

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$16,300,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.  
<sup>2</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 129.

<sup>1</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 158.  
<sup>2</sup> Includes \$100,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.

## Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1962—Continued

| Item   | Appropriations, 1961<br>(to date) | Budget estimates,<br>1962 | Recommended<br>in House bill<br>for 1962 | Amount<br>recommended<br>by Senate<br>committee | Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill<br>compared with— |                        |             |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|------------------------|-------------|
|  |                                   |                           |  |   | Appropriations, 1961  | Budget estimates, 1962 | House bill  |
| TITLE I—Continued  |                                   |                           |  |   |   |                        |             |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued                        |                                   |                           |  |   |   |                        |             |
| FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION                                  |                                   |                           |  |   |   |                        |             |
| Salaries and expenses.....   | \$13,789,000                      | \$12,525,000              | \$12,400,000                             | \$12,525,000                                    | —\$1,264,000  | -----                  | +\$125,000  |
| FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION   |                                   |                           |  |   |   |                        |             |
| Salaries and expenses.....   | 8,163,500                         | 8,793,000                 | 8,793,000                                | 8,793,000                                       | +629,500  | -----                  | -----       |
| FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION   |                                   |                           |  |   |   |                        |             |
| Salaries and expenses.....   | 8,009,500                         | \$ 10,690,000             | 10,000,000                               | 10,690,000                                      | +2,680,500  | -----                  | +690,000    |
| GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE  |                                   |                           |  |   |   |                        |             |
| Salaries and expenses.....   | 42,179,000                        | 43,000,000                | 43,000,000                               | 43,000,000                                      | +821,000  | -----                  | -----       |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION                                    |                                   |                           |  |   |   |                        |             |
| Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....                  | 169,992,000                       | 176,000,000               | 170,000,000                              | 176,000,000                                     | +6,008,000  | -----                  | +6,000,000  |
| Repair and improvement of public buildings.....                    | 58,000,000                        | 60,000,000                | 58,000,000                               | 58,000,000                                      | -----   | —\$2,000,000           | -----       |
| Construction, public buildings projects.....                       | 165,441,000                       | 181,325,000               | 171,600,000                              | 194,456,500                                     | +29,015,500   | +13,131,500            | +22,856,500 |
| Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....                 | 21,000,000                        | 5,000,000                 | -----                                    | 25,000,000                                      | +4,000,000  | +20,000,000            | +25,000,000 |
| Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.....                 | 4,000,000                         | 5,200,000                 | 5,200,000                                | 5,200,000                                       | +1,200,000  | -----                  | -----       |
| Construction, Federal office building No. 7, Washington, D. C..... | -----                             | 26,175,000                | 23,700,000                               | 23,700,000                                      | +23,700,000   | —2,475,000             | -----       |
| Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.....                    | 4,422,000                         | 3,737,000                 | 3,450,000                                | 3,737,000                                       | —685,000  | -----                  | +287,000    |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....                          | (3,242,500)                       | (3,855,000)               | (3,935,000)                              | (3,955,000)                                     | (+691,500)  | -----                  | -----       |
| Expenses, supply distribution.....                                 | 24,425,000                        | \$ 29,374,000             | 27,375,000                               | 29,374,000                                      | +4,949,000  | -----                  | +1,999,000  |
| General supply fund.....   | 20,000,000                        | 8,000,000                 | 4,000,000                                | 8,000,000                                       | —12,000,000   | -----                  | +4,000,000  |

|  |                |                 |                |               |               |               |
|--|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.....       | 10, 179, 000   | 14, 159, 000    | 14, 000, 000   | +3, 821, 000  | -159, 000     | -----         |
| Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service..... | 2, 536, 000    | 2, 500, 000     | 2, 475, 000    | -361, 000     | -325, 000     | -----         |
| Strategic and critical materials.....                                | 26, 235, 000   | 40, 000, 000    | 30, 000, 000   | +13, 765, 000 | -----         | +10, 000, 000 |
| Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.....                  | 247, 000       | 250, 000        | 290, 000       | +43, 000      | +40, 000      | -----         |
| Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.....          | 250, 000       | 300, 000        | 300, 000       | +50, 000      | -----         | -----         |
| Refunds under Renegotiation Act.....                                 | 2, 500, 000    | -----           | -----          | -2, 500, 000  | -----         | -----         |
| Administrative operations fund (limitation).....                     | (14, 113, 800) | 7(14, 864, 000) | (14, 864, 000) | (+750, 800)   | -----         | (+595, 100)   |
| Working capital fund.....  | -----          | 150, 000        | 150, 000       | +150, 000     | -----         | +150, 000     |
| Total, General Services Administration.....                          | 509, 227, 000  | 552, 170, 000   | 580, 382, 500  | +71, 155, 500 | +28, 212, 500 | +69, 992, 500 |
| HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY                                      |                |                 |                |               |               |               |
| Office of the Administrator:   |                |                 |                |               |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses.....   | 11, 015, 000   | 13, 150, 000    | 12, 900, 000   | +1, 885, 000  | -250, 000     | -----         |
| Urban planning grants.....   | 4, 000, 000    | 10, 000, 000    | 3, 600, 000    | -400, 000     | -6, 400, 000  | -----         |
| Public works planning fund.....                                      | 6, 000, 000    | 9 8, 000, 000   | 6, 000, 000    | +2, 000, 000  | -----         | +2, 000, 000  |
| Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization).....      | 150, 000, 000  | 200, 000, 000   | 200, 000, 000  | +50, 000, 000 | -----         | -----         |
| Urban studies and housing research.....                              | -----          | 19 900, 000     | 450, 000       | -----         | -900, 000     | -450, 000     |
| Housing for the elderly fund.....                                    | 20, 000, 000   | 10 30, 000, 000 | 25, 000, 000   | +5, 000, 000  | -5, 000, 000  | -----         |
| Total, Office of the Administrator.....                              | 191, 015, 000  | 262, 050, 000   | 249, 500, 000  | +53, 485, 000 | -12, 550, 000 | +1, 550, 000  |
| Public Housing Administration:                                       |                |                 |                |               |               |               |
| Annual contributions.....  | 140, 000, 000  | 169, 300, 000   | 165, 000, 000  | +25, 000, 000 | -4, 300, 000  | -----         |
| Administrative expenses.....   | 13, 868, 000   | 14, 150, 000    | 13, 968, 000   | +100, 000     | -182, 000     | -----         |
| Total, Public Housing Administration.....                            | 153, 868, 000  | 183, 450, 000   | 178, 968, 000  | +25, 100, 000 | -4, 482, 000  | -----         |
| Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency.....                          | 344, 883, 000  | 445, 500, 000   | 428, 468, 000  | +83, 585, 000 | -17, 032, 000 | +1, 550, 000  |
| INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION                                       |                |                 |                |               |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses.....   | 21, 451, 500   | 22, 200, 000    | 22, 200, 000   | +748, 500     | -----         | +250, 000     |

<sup>8</sup> Includes \$1,050,000 contained in H. Doc. 156.<sup>9</sup> Includes \$1,800,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.<sup>10</sup> Includes \$257,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.<sup>8</sup> Includes \$750,000 contained in H. Doc. 157.<sup>9</sup> Includes \$4,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 157.<sup>10</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 157.



*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1962—Continued*

| Item  | Appropriations, 1961<br>(to date) | Budget estimates, 1962      | Recommended in House bill for 1962 | Amount recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with— |                        |                |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|----------------|
|   |                                   |                             |                                    |  | Appropriations, 1961                                     | Budget estimates, 1962 | House bill     |
| TITLE I—Continued   |                                   |                             |                                    |  |  |                        |                |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued                   |                                   |                             |                                    |  |  |                        |                |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION                 |                                   |                             |                                    |  |  |                        |                |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                    | \$170,760,000                     | <sup>11</sup> \$226,686,000 | \$191,750,000                      | \$221,750,000                          | +\$50,990,000  | -\$4,936,000           | +\$30,000,000  |
| Research and development.....                                 | 670,453,000                       | <sup>12</sup> 1,295,539,000 | 892,000,000                        | 1,278,000,000                          | +\$607,547,000   | -17,539,000            | +\$86,000,000  |
| Construction of facilities.....                               | 122,787,000                       | <sup>13</sup> 262,075,000   | 116,250,000                        | 249,250,000                            | +\$126,463,000   | -12,825,000            | +\$133,000,000 |
| Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....     | 964,000,000                       | 1,784,300,000               | 1,200,000,000                      | 1,749,000,000                          | +\$785,000,000   | -35,300,000            | +\$49,000,000  |
| NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY                            |                                   |                             |                                    |  |  |                        |                |
| Operation and maintenance of properties.....                  | 40,000                            | 40,000                      | 40,000                             | -----                                  | -40,000  | -40,000                | -40,000        |
| NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION                                   |                                   |                             |                                    |  |  |                        |                |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                    | 175,800,000                       | <sup>14</sup> 275,000,000   | 250,000,000                        | 276,500,000                            | +\$100,700,000   | +\$1,500,000           | +\$26,500,000  |
| Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)..... | ( <sup>15</sup> )                 | 2,000,000                   | ( <sup>16</sup> )                  | ( <sup>16</sup> )                      | -----  | -2,000,000             | -----          |
| Total, National Science Foundation.....                       | 175,800,000                       | 277,000,000                 | 250,000,000                        | 276,500,000                            | +\$100,700,000   | -500,000               | +\$26,500,000  |
| RENEGOTIATION BOARD   |                                   |                             |                                    |  |  |                        |                |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                    | 3,015,000                         | 3,000,000                   | 2,900,000                          | 2,900,000                              | -115,000   | -100,000               | -----          |
| SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION                            |                                   |                             |                                    |  |  |                        |                |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                    | 9,517,500                         | <sup>17</sup> 11,015,000    | 11,000,000                         | 11,000,000                             | +\$1,428,500   | -15,000                | -----          |
| SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM                                      |                                   |                             |                                    |  |  |                        |                |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                    | 33,169,400                        | 34,475,000                  | 33,670,000                         | 33,670,000                             | +\$500,600   | -805,000               | -----          |

## VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

|  |               |                             |                 |               |              |             |              |
|--|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| General operating expenses.....                                  | 164,350,000   | 162,046,000                 | 161,500,000     | 162,046,000   | -2,304,000   | -----       | +\$546,000   |
| Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses..... | 35,165,000    | 15,053,000                  | 40,700,000      | 47,053,000    | +11,888,000  | +32,000,000 | +6,353,000   |
| Medical care.....  | 863,206,000   | 1,009,171,000               | 987,171,000     | 987,171,000   | +123,965,000 | -22,000,000 | -----        |
| Compensation and pensions.....                                   | 3,800,000,000 | <sup>13</sup> 3,543,000,000 | 3,500,000,000   | 3,500,000,000 | -300,000,000 | -43,000,000 | -----        |
| Readjustment benefits.....                                       | 344,000,000   | 80,376,000                  | 80,000,000      | 80,000,000    | -264,000,000 | -376,000    | -----        |
| Veterans insurance and indemnities.....                          | 48,800,000    | 39,200,000                  | 39,200,000      | 39,200,000    | -9,600,000   | -----       | -----        |
| Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....                   | 1,000,000     | 1,000,000                   | 1,000,000       | 1,000,000     | -----        | -----       | -----        |
| Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....         | 75,000,000    | 75,000,000                  | 75,000,000      | 77,500,000    | +2,500,000   | +2,500,000  | +2,500,000   |
| Loan guarantee revolving fund.....                               | -----         | <sup>(19)</sup>             | -----           | -----         | -----        | -----       | -----        |
| Outpatient care.....   | 90,034,000    | <sup>(20)</sup>             | <sup>(20)</sup> | -----         | -90,034,000  | -----       | -----        |
| Maintenance and operation of supply depots.....                  | 2,643,000     | <sup>(21)</sup>             | <sup>(21)</sup> | -----         | -2,643,000   | -----       | -----        |
| Total, Veterans' Administration.....                             | 5,424,198,000 | 4,924,846,000               | 4,884,571,000   | 4,893,970,000 | -530,228,000 | -80,876,000 | +9,399,000   |
| Total, definite appropriations.....                              | 8,490,299,900 | 9,170,626,000               | 8,400,163,000   | 9,094,679,500 | +604,379,600 | -75,946,500 | +694,516,500 |
| Total, indefinite appropriations.....                            | 3,243,500     | 3,935,000                   | 3,935,000       | 3,935,000     | +691,500     | -----       | -----        |
| Total, title I.....  | 8,493,543,400 | 9,174,561,000               | 8,404,098,000   | 9,098,614,500 | +605,071,100 | -75,946,500 | +694,516,500 |

<sup>11</sup> Includes \$6,700,000 contained in H. Doc. 125 and \$30,000,000 in H. Doc. 179.<sup>12</sup> Includes \$99,720,000 contained in H. Doc. 125 and \$376,000,000 in H. Doc. 179.<sup>13</sup> Includes \$19,250,000 contained in H. Doc. 125 and \$143,000,000 in H. Doc. 179.<sup>14</sup> Includes \$65,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.<sup>15</sup> Not to exceed \$1,600,000 of salaries and expenses made available on a permissive basis.<sup>16</sup> Senate recommends \$2,000,000.<sup>17</sup> Includes \$100,000 contained in H. Doc. 162.<sup>18</sup> Includes decrease of \$25,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 129.<sup>19</sup> Indefinite amount by transfer from "Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund."<sup>20</sup> Item consolidated with "Medical care."<sup>21</sup> Expenses to be financed in 1962 through supply fund.





Calendar No. 593

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 7445

[Report No. 620]

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 8, 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 25, 1961

Reported by Mr. MAGNUSON, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4      in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry in-  
5      dependent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpo-  
6      rations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June  
7      30, 1962, namely:

1

## TITLE I

2

## EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

4

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem, \$320,000.

13

## OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

14

## MOBILIZATION

15

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; *purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed \$6,000*; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense and defense mobilization functions; not to exceed ~~\$3,000~~ \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall

1 be final and conclusive; and not to exceed \$900,000 for  
 2 expenses of travel, *excluding rental of passenger motor ve-*  
 3 *hicles from General Services Administration*; \$25,000,000:  
 4 *Provided, That the foregoing amount shall be available for*  
 5 *not to exceed 303 positions in the District of Columbia area:*  
 6 *Provided further, That contracts for not to exceed two per-*  
 7 *sons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent*  
 8 *services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,*  
 9 *1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually, and one*  
 10 *such contract, for the services of an expert or consultant for*  
 11 *telecommunications, may provide for a per diem rate of not*  
 12 *to exceed \$75.*

### 13 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS 14 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

15 For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies  
 16 to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization func-  
 17 tions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense  
 18 Mobilization, including payments by the Department of  
 19 Labor to State employment security agencies for the full  
 20 cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization ac-  
 21 tivities, ~~\$6,567,000~~ \$5,000,000.

### 22 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

23 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense  
 24 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,  
 25 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds, \$22,-



1 000,000, of which not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be avail-  
2 able for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of  
3 said Act.

#### 4 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

5 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,  
6 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense  
7 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of  
8 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,  
9 ~~\$21,600,000~~ *\$38,500,000*.

#### 10 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
12 studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil  
13 defense and defense mobilization, including evacuation, shel-  
14 ter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by  
15 section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,  
16 as amended, and other law, including services as authorized  
17 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
18 ~~\$1,500,000~~ *\$2,500,000*, to remain available until expended.

#### 19 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

20 For expenses necessary for the design, construction, and  
21 equipment of protected regional facilities for the Office of  
22 Civil and Defense Mobilization, *\$2,500,000*, to remain avail-  
23 able until expended.

## GENERAL PROVISION

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

## FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

## DISASTER RELIEF

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5

1 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100  
2 per diem; \$8,900,000.

3 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
4 AUTHORIZATION)

5 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-  
6 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board  
7 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49  
8 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$74,800,000  
9 \$81,700,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 \$6,900,000  
10 shall be available for subsidy for helicopter operations during  
11 the current fiscal year, to remain available until expended.

12 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For necessary expenses, including services as authorized  
15 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C.  
16 55a) ; not to exceed \$10,000 for medical examinations per-  
17 formed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; pay-  
18 ment in advance for library membership in societies whose  
19 publications are available to members only or to members  
20 at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed  
21 \$83,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Com-  
22 mission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reim-  
23 bursement of the General Services Administration for  
24 security guard services for protection of confidential files;  
25 and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial services by contract,



1 without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as  
2 amended; ~~\$21,029,000~~ \$21,669,000: *Provided*, That no  
3 part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career  
4 Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of  
5 March 4, 1958, as amended.

6 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil  
7 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and  
8 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and  
9 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established  
10 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

11 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR  
12 EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

13 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Ex-  
14 ecutive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,  
15 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary  
16 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of  
17 other international organizations, certain information con-  
18 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered  
19 for employment by such organizations, including services  
20 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
21 U.S.C. 55a), \$430,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation  
22 shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the  
23 applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Com-  
24 mission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses  
25 incurred by such agencies under said Executive order:

1 *Provided further*, That members of the International Organ-  
2 izations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual trans-  
3 portation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence au-  
4 thorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,  
5 while traveling on official business away from their homes  
6 or regular places of business, including periods while en  
7 route to and from and at the place where their services are  
8 to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections  
9 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section  
10 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed  
11 to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time  
12 or intermittent service as a member of the International Or-  
13 ganizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service  
14 Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated  
15 January 9, 1953, as amended.

16 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

17 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May  
18 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of  
19 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),  
20 \$2,248,000.

21 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

22 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

23 For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund"  
24 of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as

1 authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health  
2 Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$4,500,000, to remain avail-  
3 able until expended.

4 GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION, RETIRED EMPLOYEES  
5 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

6 For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits  
7 fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired  
8 employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal  
9 Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850),  
10 \$19,000,000.

11 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND  
12 DISABILITY FUND

13 For financing the annuity benefits and increases provided  
14 by the Act of June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$44,637,000,  
15 to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability  
16 fund : *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission shall in-  
17 clude annually, in its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget,  
18 estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the  
19 civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts  
20 paid out of the fund by reason of the enactment of Public  
21 Law 85-465, and the Bureau of the Budget shall submit an-  
22 nually to the Congress estimates of the appropriations neces-  
23 sary to reimburse the fund for such amounts.



1   LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES  
2                   HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

3       Not to exceed ~~\$1,000,000~~ \$1,148,000 of the funds in  
4   the “Employees health benefits fund” shall be available for  
5   reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for adminis-  
6   trative expenses incurred by the Commission during the  
7   current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal  
8   Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 713),  
9   including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
10  August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) .

11  LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES  
12                   LIFE INSURANCE FUND

13       Not to exceed \$260,000 of the funds in the “Employees  
14  life insurance fund” shall be available for reimbursement to  
15  the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses  
16  incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year  
17  in the administration of the Federal Employees’ Group Life  
18  Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103) ,  
19  including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act  
20  of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) : *Provided*, That this  
21  limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10  
22  of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of  
23  Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c) ) .

## FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

## OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; not to exceed \$10,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; ~~\$428,000,000~~ \$440,600,000: *Provided*, That total costs of aviation medicine research for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed \$1,500,000 or include in excess of 120 positions: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

## FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the con-

1 construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommoda-  
2 tions for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation  
3 Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommo-  
4 dations are not available (at a total cost of construction of  
5 not to exceed \$50,000 per housing unit in Alaska) ; and  
6 purchase of nine aircraft; ~~\$120,000,000~~ \$124,577,000, to  
7 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may  
8 be credited to this appropriation funds received from States,  
9 counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private  
10 sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air  
11 navigation facilities: ~~*Provided further*, That no part of the~~  
12 ~~foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construc-~~  
13 ~~tion of a new wind tunnel.~~

14 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF  
15 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

16 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority  
17 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to  
18 enter into contracts, \$70,000,000, to remain available until  
19 expended.

20 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

21 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
22 research, development, and service testing in accordance  
23 with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C.



1301-1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$60,000,-000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON

NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms, *purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year* and arms and ammunition, \$3,225,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms, *purchase of three passenger motor vehicles* and arms and ammunition, \$1,975,000.

CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Washington National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,200,000, to remain available until expended.

1        CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, ADDITIONAL  
2                                WASHINGTON AIRPORT

3        For an additional amount for "Construction and de-  
4 velopment, additional Washington airport", ~~\$26,100,000~~  
5 ~~\$20,100,000~~, to remain available until expended.

6                                CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

7        For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
8 the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including  
9 advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section  
10 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529),  
11 ~~\$10,000,000~~ ~~\$12,000,000~~, to remain available until ex-  
12 pended.

13                                GENERAL PROVISION

14        During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations  
15 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the  
16 Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified  
17 in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C.  
18 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Ad-  
19 ministrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance  
20 and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles  
21 and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as au-  
22 thorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5  
23 U.S.C. 2131).

## 1       FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

## 2                       SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3       For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the  
4 Commission as authorized by law, including land and struc-  
5 tures (not to exceed \$48,000), special counsel fees, improve-  
6 ment and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to  
7 exceed \$15,600), services as authorized by section 15 of the  
8 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of  
9 not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement  
10 only, ~~\$12,400,000~~ \$12,525,000: *Provided, That the limi-*  
11 *tation until June 30, 1962, on the availability of the appro-*  
12 *priation for a special ultra-high frequency television study,*  
13 *contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act,*  
14 *1961, under the head "Federal Communications Commis-*  
15 *sion", is hereby extended until December 31, 1962.*

## 16                       FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

## 17                       SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18       For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,  
19 as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor  
20 vehicles and not to exceed \$558,000 for expenses of travel,  
21 \$8,793,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be avail-  
22 able for special counsel and services as authorized by section  
23 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).



## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), ~~\$10,000,000~~ \$10,690,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

## GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$43,000,000.

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

## OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;

1 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)  
2 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of  
3 building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and dis-  
4 posal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests there-  
5 in; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of  
6 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); ~~\$170,000,000~~  
7 *\$176,000,000: Provided*, That this appropriation shall be  
8 available, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June  
9 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to  
10 buildings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appro-  
11 priation for "Emergency operating expenses".

12 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

13 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to  
14 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pur-  
15 suant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479),  
16 including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves  
17 and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent  
18 thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for  
19 public buildings; preliminary planning of projects by con-  
20 tract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition,  
21 and equipment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until ex-  
22 pended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropria-  
23 tion, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings  
24 Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the

1 Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C.  
 2 901 et. seq.), and Public Health Service facilities (except  
 3 Indian health facilities), *and buildings under the control of*  
 4 *another department or agency where alteration of such build-*  
 5 *ings is required in connection with the moving of such other*  
 6 *department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be,*  
 7 *under the control of General Services Administration* shall be  
 8 considered to be public buildings.

#### 9 CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

10 For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise  
 11 provided for, necessary to construct public buildings projects  
 12 and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where  
 13 the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000  
 14 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat.  
 15 479), including equipment for such buildings, ~~\$171,600,~~  
 16 ~~000~~ \$194,456,500, and not to exceed \$500,000 of this  
 17 amount shall be available to the Administrator for construc-  
 18 tion, ~~sites and expenses for~~ of small public buildings outside  
 19 the District of Columbia as the Administrator approves and  
 20 deems necessary, all to remain available until expended:  
 21 *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for  
 22 public buildings projects at locations and at maximum con-  
 23 struction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and  
 24 expenses) as follows:



1 Post office and Federal office building, Decatur, Ala-  
2 bama, \$1,315,750;

3 Customhouse and Federal office building, Los Angeles,  
4 California, \$27,388,500;

5 Customs and appraisers warehouse, *Los Angeles-Long*  
6 *beach Harbor* area, California, \$2,000,000;

7 Courthouse and Federal office building, Denver, Colo-  
8 rado, \$18,145,000;

9 *General Services Administration stores depot, Denver,*  
10 *Colorado, \$5,510,000;*

11 Post office and Federal office building, Statesboro,  
12 Georgia, \$538,650, which shall be known as the Prince  
13 H. Preston Building;

14 Post office and Federal office building, Winder, Georgia,  
15 \$475,000;

16 Post office and Federal office building (construction and  
17 alteration), Wyandotte, Michigan, \$402,800;

18 *Post office building, Tupelo, Mississippi, \$789,000;*

19 Post office and Federal office building, Santa Fe, New  
20 Mexico, \$2,362,650;

21 Customhouse, courthouse, and Federal office building,  
22 New York, New York, \$59,222,050;

23 Post office and courthouse, Bryson City, North Carolina,  
24 \$753,350;

1 Post office building, Thomasville, North Carolina, \$327,-  
2 750;

3 Border station, Pembina, North Dakota, \$183,350;

4 Federal office building, Cincinnati, Ohio, \$17,432,500;

5 Post office and Federal office building, Medford, Oregon,  
6 \$1,728,050;

7 Post office and Federal office building (construction and  
8 alteration), Johnstown, Pennsylvania, \$1,187,500;

9 Post office and Federal office building, Lebanon, Penn-  
10 sylvania, \$730,550;

11 *Federal office building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania,*  
12 *\$20,000,000;*

13 *Post office building, Dyersburg, Tennessee, \$901,000;*

14 Border station, Derby Line, Vermont, \$267,900;

15 *Post office and courthouse, Montpelier, Vermont,*  
16 *\$1,258,000;*

17 Government Printing Office field plant, District of Co-  
18 lumbia, \$1,545,650: *Provided further*, That the maximum  
19 construction improvement costs heretofore approved for the  
20 following projects are hereby increased as follows:

21 Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of  
22 Columbia, is increased from “\$15,105,000” to “\$18,905,-  
23 000”, including \$5,700,000 for laboratory and other equip-  
24 ment;

1 Courthouse and Federal office building, Chicago, Illi-  
 2 nois, is increased from “\$5,500,000” to “\$36,793,000”, in-  
 3 cluding construction of the first of two buildings authorized  
 4 at this location: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limits  
 5 of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are ef-  
 6 fected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum:  
 7 *Provided further*, That funds in the amount of \$5,601,500  
 8 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices  
 9 Appropriation Act, 1961, for a construction and alteration  
 10 project at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, since abandoned as  
 11 to its previously approved scope, are hereby made available  
 12 for the purposes of this appropriation.

13 *SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS*

14 *For an additional amount for expenses necessary in*  
 15 *connection with the construction of public buildings projects*  
 16 *not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in*  
 17 *the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and*  
 18 *1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings*  
 19 *projects by contract or otherwise \$25,000,000, to remain*  
 20 *available until expended.*

21 *PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS*

22 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any  
 23 other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to



1 the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40  
2 U.S.C. 356), \$5,200,000.

3 CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7,  
4 WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

5 For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise  
6 provided for, necessary to construct Federal Office Building  
7 Numbered 7 in Washington, District of Columbia, for use  
8 of agencies of the executive branch, in accordance with plans  
9 and specifications provided for in the Independent Offices  
10 Appropriation Acts, 1959 and 1961 (72 Stat. 1067 and 74  
11 Stat. 432), \$23,700,000, to remain available until expended.

12 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

13 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-  
14 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not other-  
15 wise provided for, ~~\$3,450,000~~ \$3,737,000: *Provided*, That  
16 not to exceed \$3,935,000 of any funds received during the  
17 current or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204  
18 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act  
19 of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law,  
20 shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and shall  
21 be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the func-  
22 tions of the General Services Administration under the said  
23 Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess  
24 and surplus personal property.

EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system, and contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items, ~~\$27,375,000~~, \$29,374,000.

GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

To increase the general supply fund established by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 630g), ~~\$4,000,000~~ \$8,000,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND  
RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, \$14,000,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC  
UTILITIES SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation and public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals, ~~\$2,475,000~~ \$2,175,000.

1        *No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be*  
2        *used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or argu-*  
3        *ments before Federal and State Regulatory Agencies con-*  
4        *cerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall*  
5        *earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation*  
6        *or utility companies.*

7                                STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

8        For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions  
9        of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50  
10       U.S.C. 98-98h), during the current fiscal year, for trans-  
11       portation and handling, within the United States (including  
12       charges at United States ports), storage, security, and main-  
13       tenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or trans-  
14       ferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to  
15       section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
16       Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b) ), for carrying  
17       out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of  
18       1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools and  
19       industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General  
20       Services Administration is responsible, including reimburse-  
21       ment for security guard services, services as authorized by  
22       section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),



1 and not to exceed \$3,000,000 for operating expenses,  
2 ~~\$30,000,000~~ \$40,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of funds  
3 available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank  
4 storage facilities: *Provided further*, That during the current  
5 fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized  
6 to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in  
7 excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and mainte-  
8 nance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment  
9 held pursuant to the aforesaid Acts ~~provided~~ said leasehold  
10 interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided*  
11 *further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be  
12 no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical  
13 materials which, in accordance with section 6 (a) of the  
14 Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C.  
15 98e (a) ), may be transferred without reimbursement to  
16 stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Pro-*  
17 *vided further*, That any receipts from sales during the cur-  
18 rent fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treas-  
19 ury: ~~*Provided further*~~, That during the current fiscal year  
20 materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense  
21 Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be available,  
22 without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value  
23 to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, proc-

1 essing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to sec-  
2 tion 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling  
3 Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

#### 4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

5 For expenses of executive direction for activities under  
6 the control of the General Services Administration, \$290,-  
7 000.

8 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER  
9 PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$300,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited into said account for the fiscal year 1962 from funds made available to General Services Administration

1 in this Act shall not exceed ~~\$14,268,900~~ \$14,864,000: *Pro-*  
2 *vided further,* That amounts deposited into said account for  
3 administrative operations for each program shall not exceed  
4 the amounts included in the respective program appropria-  
5 tions for such purposes.

#### 6 WORKING CAPITAL FUND

7 *To increase the capital of the working capital fund es-*  
8 *tablished by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293),*  
9 *\$150,000.*

#### 10 GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the  
12 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)  
13 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,  
14 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from  
15 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;  
16 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to  
17 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the  
18 General Services Administration, issued by public authorities,  
19 States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect  
20 to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems  
21 necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request  
22 and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from  
23 the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropria-  
24 tions or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to  
25 the General Services Administration, in connection with



1 property transferred to the General Services Administration  
2 pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff),  
3 and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with  
4 the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

5 Appropriations under the heading "Construction, Public  
6 Buildings Projects" shall be available for (1) acquisition of  
7 buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or  
8 otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2)  
9 extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and  
10 (3) construction of projects for new public buildings ap-  
11 proved pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959, in  
12 addition to those set forth under that appropriation.

13 Funds available to the General Services Administration  
14 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

15 No part of any money appropriated by this or any  
16 other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the  
17 Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for  
18 the purchase within the continental limits of the United  
19 States of any typewriting machines except in accordance  
20 with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the  
21 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,  
22 as amended.

23 *Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made*  
24 *available to the General Services Administration for the*  
25 *current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any*

1 *other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall*  
2 *be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: Provided,*  
3 *That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses,*  
4 *and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of*  
5 *\$2,000,000.*

6 Appropriations available to any department or agency  
7 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, in-  
8 cluding maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be  
9 available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services  
10 Administration for those expenses of renovation and altera-  
11 tion of buildings and facilities which constitute public im-  
12 provements, performed in accordance with the Public Build-  
13 ings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law,  
14 and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropria-  
15 tions to said Administration for rents and related expenses,  
16 not otherwise provided for, of providing, directly or indi-  
17 rectly, such suitable general purpose space as may be re-  
18 quired by any such department or agency, in the District  
19 of Columbia or elsewhere.

## 20 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### 21 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

#### 22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Adminis-  
24 trator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the

1 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and purchase of  
2 two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$12,-  
3 900,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of inspections  
4 and of providing representatives at the site of projects being  
5 planned or undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to  
6 title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects  
7 financed through loans to educational institutions author-  
8 ized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended,  
9 projects and facilities financed by loans to public agencies  
10 pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as  
11 amended, urban planning financed through grants to State  
12 and local government agencies pursuant to title VII of the  
13 Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and reserves of planned  
14 public works financed through advances to municipalities  
15 and other public agencies pursuant to title VII of the Hous-  
16 ing Act of 1954, as amended, shall be compensated by such  
17 agencies or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in  
18 the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services,  
19 and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadmin-  
20 istrative; and for the purpose of providing such inspections,  
21 the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency  
22 may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from  
23 such institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such  
24 amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such



1 charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses  
2 shall not exceed \$3,000,000.

### 3 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

4 For grants in accordance with the provisions of sec-  
5 tion 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$3,600,-  
6 000.

### 7 PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

8 For the revolving fund established pursuant to section  
9 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C.  
10 462), ~~\$6,000,000~~ \$8,000,000.

### 11 URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT 12 AUTHORIZATION)

13 For an additional amount for payment of grants as au-  
14 thorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended  
15 (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$200,000,000.

### 16 URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

17 For urban studies and housing research as authorized by  
18 the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, includ-  
19 ing administrative expenses in connection therewith,  
20 \$450,000.

### 21 HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

22 For the revolving fund established pursuant to section  
23 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$25,000,000: *Provided*,  
24 That not to exceed \$350,000 of the foregoing amount shall

1 be available for administrative expenses during the current  
2 fiscal year.

3 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

4 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

5 For the payment of annual contributions to public  
6 housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United  
7 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),  
8 \$165,000,000.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

10 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing  
11 Administration, \$13,968,000, to be expended under the  
12 authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this  
13 Act.

14 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce  
17 Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the em-  
18 ployment of special counsel; services as authorized by section  
19 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and pur-  
20 chase of not to exceed forty-two passenger motor vehicles of  
21 which thirty-six shall be for replacement only; ~~\$21,950,000~~  
22 \$22,200,000, of which not less than \$1,696,700 shall be  
23 available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety  
24 activities and not less than \$1,129,000 shall be available for  
25 expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection ac-

1 tivities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and coop-  
 2 erating State commissioners may use Government transpor-  
 3 tation requests when traveling in connection with their  
 4 duties as such.

## 5 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE 6 ADMINISTRATION

### 7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of  
 9 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, includ-  
 10 ing not to exceed ~~\$8,000,000~~ \$10,395,000 for expenses of  
 11 travel, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized  
 12 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.  
 13 2131) ; ~~\$191,750,000~~ \$221,750,000.

### 14 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

15 For contractual research, development, operations, tech-  
 16 nical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction,  
 17 and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the  
 18 conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and  
 19 development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space  
 20 Administration, including maintenance and operation of  
 21 aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of  
 22 fourteen passenger motor vehicles, including one at not to  
 23 exceed \$6,000, of which seven shall be for replacement only;  
 24 ~~\$892,000,000~~ \$1,278,000,000, to remain available until ex-  
 25 pended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall



1 be available for payment of salaries of National Aeronau-  
 2 tics and Space Administration personnel.

### 3 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

4 For construction of facilities for the National Aeronau-  
 5 tics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or con-  
 6 demnation of real property, as authorized by law, ~~\$116,250,-~~  
 7 ~~000~~ \$249,250,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be available  
 8 for emergency construction of facilities in accord with see-  
 9 tion 3 of the legislative authorization for appropriations for  
 10 the fiscal year 1962, to remain available until expended.

### 11 GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made  
 13 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-  
 14 tion by this Act may be transferred to any other such appro-  
 15 priation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation  
 16 shall not be thereby increased.

17 Not to exceed ~~\$15,000~~ \$20,000 of appropriations in this  
 18 Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
 19 shall be available for such scientific consultations and emer-  
 20 gency or extraordinary expense as may be authorized by  
 21 law.

### 22 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

#### 23 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

24 For the operation and maintenance of properties under  
 25 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act,

1 \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales,  
 2 leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury  
 3 of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so  
 4 long as funds are available from appropriations for the  
 5 foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the  
 6 Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Con-  
 7 gress), shall not be effective.

## 8 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### 9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
 11 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42  
 12 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellow-  
 13 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
 14 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire of passenger motor  
 15 vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Admin-  
 16 istration for security guard services; ~~\$250,000,000~~ \$276,-  
 17 500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That  
 18 of the foregoing amount not less than ~~\$37,600,000~~ \$32,200,-  
 19 000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in  
 20 connection with a program of supplementary training for  
 21 secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Pro-*  
 22 *vided further*, That not to exceed ~~\$1,600,000~~ \$2,000,000  
 23 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase for-  
 24 eign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural  
 25 Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended

1 (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section  
2 104 (k) of that Act.

3 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-  
6 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, *not to exceed*  
7 *\$45,000 for expenses of travel* and services as authorized  
8 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
9 \$2,900,000.

10 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-  
13 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and  
14 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
15 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) *at rates for individuals not to exceed*  
16 *\$100 per diem*, \$11,000,000.

17 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-  
20 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I  
21 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62  
22 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by  
23 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);



not to exceed \$62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and \$19,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; \$33,670,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

## VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

### GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; ~~\$161,500,000~~ \$162,046,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

## 1 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

## 2 OPERATING EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for administration of the medi-  
4 cal, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research,  
5 employee education and training activities, and expenses nec-  
6 essary for carrying out programs of medical research, as  
7 authorized by law, ~~\$40,700,000~~ \$47,053,000, of which  
8 ~~\$27,000,000~~ \$32,000,000 shall be available for medical re-  
9 search: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the foregoing appro-  
10 priations shall remain available until expended for prosthetic  
11 testing and development.

## 12 MEDICAL CARE

13 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-  
14 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as  
15 authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treat-  
16 ment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration includ-  
17 ing care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction  
18 of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational  
19 articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms;  
20 repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the  
21 several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the  
22 Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either  
23 by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and  
24 purchase of materials; purchase of seventy-two passenger  
25 motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances

1 therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; and aid  
2 to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,  
3 United States Code; \$987,171,000, plus reimbursements:  
4 *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from  
5 this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education,  
6 and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy,  
7 and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them  
8 under the various headings of their applicable appropriations,  
9 of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment  
10 of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

#### 11 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

12 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,  
13 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-  
14 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence al-  
15 lowances for vocational rehabilitation) , authorized under any  
16 Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon,  
17 including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities,  
18 the administration of which is now or may hereafter be  
19 placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment  
20 of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and  
21 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, \$3,500,000,-  
22 000, to remain available until expended.

#### 23 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

24 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans  
25 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment



1 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and  
 2 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-  
 3 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38,  
 4 United States Code, \$80,000,000, to remain available un-  
 5 til expended.

#### 6 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

7 For military and naval insurance, for national service  
 8 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-  
 9 disabled veterans insurance, \$39,200,000, to remain avail-  
 10 able until expended.

#### 11 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

12 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants  
 13 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United  
 14 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-  
 15 ment of veterans, \$1,000,000.

#### 16 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY

#### 17 FACILITIES

18 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and  
 19 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-  
 20 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans  
 21 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections  
 22 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, ~~\$75,-~~  
 23 ~~000,000~~ \$77,500,000, to remain available until expended:  
 24 *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and

1 domiciliary facilities” in the Independent Offices Appropria-  
 2 tion Act, 1957, on the amount available for technical serv-  
 3 ices for replacement of the general medical and surgical hos-  
 4 pital at Nashville, Tennessee, is reduced from “\$1,500,000”  
 5 to “\$921,600”.

#### 6 LOAN ~~GUARANTEE~~ *GUARANTY* REVOLVING FUND

7 During the current fiscal year, the Loan ~~guarantee~~  
 8 *guaranty* revolving fund shall be available for expenses, ~~but~~  
 9 ~~not to exceed \$120,624,000,~~ for property acquisitions and  
 10 other loan ~~guarantee~~ *guaranty* and insurance operations un-  
 11 der Chapter 37, Title 38, United States Code, except admin-  
 12 istrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such  
 13 title: *Provided*, That the retained earnings of the Direct loans  
 14 to veterans and reserves revolving fund shall be available,  
 15 during the current fiscal year, for transfer to said Loan  
 16 ~~guarantee~~ *guaranty* revolving fund in such amounts as may  
 17 be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses.

#### 18 SUPPLY FUND

19 During the current fiscal year, the Supply fund shall be  
 20 available for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle.

#### 21 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

22 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the  
 23 current fiscal year for “Compensation and pensions”, “Read-  
 24 justment benefits”, and “Veterans insurance and indemni-

1 ties” may be transferred to any other of the mentioned ap-  
2 propriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-  
3 priations so augmented.

4 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-  
5 tion for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall  
6 be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the  
7 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

8 The appropriation available to the Veterans Adminis-  
9 tration for the current fiscal year for “Medical care” shall  
10 be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental  
11 thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of  
12 title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Vet-  
13 erans Administration receiving care under such appropria-  
14 tions.

15 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-  
16 erans Administration (except the appropriation for “Con-  
17 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities”) shall be  
18 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the con-  
19 struction of any new hospital or home.

20 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-  
21 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except  
22 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits  
23 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ap-  
24 propriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administra-  
25 tor of Veterans Affairs.



## 1 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-  
3 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-  
4 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel  
5 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in  
6 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*  
7 *vided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed  
8 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards  
9 of the Selective Service System, ~~or~~ to travel performed in  
10 connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the  
11 Civil Aeronautics Board *or to payments to interagency motor*  
12 *pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules.*

13 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in  
14 this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person  
15 filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly  
16 held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces  
17 of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his  
18 period of active military or naval service and has within  
19 ninety days after his release from such service or from hos-  
20 pitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not  
21 more than one year made application for restoration to his  
22 former position and has been certified by the Civil Service  
23 Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his  
24 former position and has not been restored thereto.

25 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available

1 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase  
2 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new  
3 offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this  
4 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been ap-  
5 proved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

## 6 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

7 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,  
8 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the  
9 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each  
10 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to  
11 make such contracts and commitments without regard to  
12 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the  
13 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may  
14 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the  
15 Budget for the fiscal year 1962 for each such corporation  
16 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

### 17 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

#### 18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA- 19 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

20 Not to exceed a total of \$1,725,000 shall be available  
21 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank  
22 Board, including services as authorized by section 15 of the  
23 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed  
24 \$100 per diem for individuals, and shall be derived from funds  
25 available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including

1 those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund  
2 and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administra-  
3 tion, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home  
4 Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal  
5 years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment  
6 for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the  
7 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan In-  
8 surance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government  
9 (including payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all  
10 necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship  
11 of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan In-  
12 surance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-  
13 ceedings under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan  
14 Act of 1933 or section 407 or 408 of the National Housing  
15 Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed  
16 on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal  
17 services) in connection with the handling, including the  
18 purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Fed-  
19 eral home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement  
20 of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the  
21 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-  
22 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes  
23 hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates  
24 of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be  
25 entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by



1 the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance  
2 at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council  
3 and may be paid not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of  
4 subsistence: *Provided further*, That expenses of any func-  
5 tions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks)  
6 vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as  
7 nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That, not-  
8 withstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for  
9 the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the admin-  
10 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall  
11 be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the pro-  
12 visions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22,  
13 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Provided fur-*  
14 *ther*, That the nonadministrative expenses (except those  
15 included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and  
16 examination of Federal and State chartered institutions  
17 (other than special examinations determined by the Board  
18 to be necessary) shall not exceed \$10,366,000.

19 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL  
20 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

21 Not to exceed \$890,000 shall be available for adminis-  
22 trative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall  
23 be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capital-  
24 ized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation  
25 of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of pro-

ceedings under section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-1730a).

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

Not to exceed \$42,500 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1

1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the cur-  
2 rent fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the  
3 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein  
4 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to in-  
5 clude all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-  
6 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including  
7 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative  
8 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of serv-  
9 ices performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with  
10 the termination of contracts or in the performance of legal  
11 services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of admin-  
12 istrative expenses to the account shall be made in accord-  
13 ance with generally recognized accounting principles and  
14 practices.

15 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY  
16 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
17 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

18 Not to exceed ~~\$1,900,000~~ \$2,100,000 shall be available  
19 for all administrative expenses of carrying out the functions  
20 of the Administrator under the program of housing loans to  
21 educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950,  
22 as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall  
23 be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the  
24 Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal  
25 home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning



1 of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corpora-  
 2 tion (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264)  
 3 which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury  
 4 as a depository of public money of the United States.

5 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
 6 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

7 Not to exceed ~~\$650,000~~ \$750,000 of funds in the revolv-  
 8 ing fund established pursuant to title II of Housing Amend-  
 9 ments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for admin-  
 10 istrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of  
 11 payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve  
 12 banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks,  
 13 and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creat-  
 14 ing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of  
 15 August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has  
 16 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a  
 17 depository of public money of the United States.

18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
 19 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-  
 20 ING PROGRAMS)

21 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$145,000  
 22 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this  
 23 amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case  
 24 of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Gov-  
 25 ernment and legal services on a contract or fee basis and

1 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve  
2 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the  
3 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-  
4 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the  
5 Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal  
6 Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has  
7 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-  
8 pository of public money of the United States.

9       LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL  
10               NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

11       Not to exceed \$7,400,000 shall be available for admin-  
12 istrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and  
13 shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including ex-  
14 penses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or  
15 fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of  
16 securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures,  
17 fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services  
18 performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not  
19 including other personal services) in connection with the  
20 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improve-  
21 ment, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to  
22 said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries,  
23 wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed out-  
24 side of the continental United States, expenses of services  
25 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the

performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

#### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$9,600,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) : *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed \$1,500) : *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing shall not exceed ~~\$58,000,000~~ \$61,300,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitation shall not apply to fees and other expenses paid by and between private parties in



1 *connection with cases processed under the Certified Agency*  
2 *Program.*

3 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-  
4 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

5 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-  
6 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the admin-  
7 istrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in  
8 carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act  
9 of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433), including  
10 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by  
11 the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) :  
12 *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representa-  
13 tives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal proj-  
14 ects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal  
15 projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Ad-  
16 ministration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the  
17 payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to  
18 the development costs of such projects will cover the costs  
19 of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Ad-  
20 ministration for such purpose shall be considered nonad-  
21 ministrative expenses, and funds received from such pay-  
22 ments may be used only for the payment of necessary ex-  
23 penses of providing representatives of the Administration  
24 at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That  
25 all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not spe-

1 cifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties im-  
2 posed by law, shall not exceed \$1,200,000.

3 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in  
5 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
6 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for  
7 publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or  
8 defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

9 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in  
10 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
11 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to  
12 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel  
13 work in excess of the number that would be provided by a  
14 ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five,  
15 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent em-  
16 ployees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*,  
17 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-  
18 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend halftime  
19 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction  
20 and administration of the personnel program; employment,  
21 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;  
22 employee relations and services; wage administration; and  
23 processing, recording, and reporting.

24 SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in  
25 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any

1 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for  
2 construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or  
3 leased buildings except where specifically provided.

4 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Ap-  
5 propriation Act, 1962".

Passed the House of Representatives June 7, 1961.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*





## **AN ACT**

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

---

JUNE 8, 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Appropriations

JULY 25, 1961

Reported with amendments







Requires that insofar as practicable surplus agricultural commodities to be furnished on a grant basis must be bought only in the U. S. except to the extent that they are not available here in sufficient quantities to meet emergency conditions.

Authorizes Government agencies to furnish services and commodities on a reimbursable basis to nations, international organizations, and voluntary non-profit relief agencies, whenever the President determines that this would further the purposes of international development programs.

Provides that, with respect to development loans, development grants and supporting assistance, funds in excess of \$100,000 cannot be obligated until engineering, financial, and other plans necessary to carry out the project have been completed and there is a reasonably firm estimate of the cost of the project to the U. S., and, in the case of water or related land resource construction project, plans must include a computation of benefits and costs made insofar as practicable in accordance with Budget Bureau procedures for such projects in the U. S.

Provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall have responsibility for accounting and valuation with respect to foreign credits and foreign currencies owed to or owned by the U. S. and, in carrying out this responsibility, the Secretary shall issue regulations binding upon all agencies of the Government. Gives the Secretary sole authority to establish the exchange rates at which all foreign currencies or credits are to be used by all Government agencies. Requires each Government agency to report to the Secretary of the Treasury an inventory as of June 30, 1961, showing all foreign currencies on hand, and similar reports semiannually thereafter, for use of the Secretary in preparing consolidated reports to Congress.

Includes administrative provisions for carrying out the provisions of the bill, including authority for creation of a new agency in the Department of State with responsibility for non-military foreign aid functions, the abolition of the International Cooperation Administration and transfer of its personnel, property, etc., to the new agency, and transfer to the new agency of the Export-Import Bank's assets and liabilities under sec. 104 (e) of Public Law 480 which makes available for loans to private business abroad up to 25 percent of the foreign currencies received in sales of surplus agricultural commodities.

Provides for the repeal of the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, except for certain specified sections. One section continued in force is section 402 which provides for earmarking \$175 million of foreign aid funds in fiscal year 1961 for financing the export and sale for foreign currencies or the grant of surplus agricultural commodities. Although this provision which applied to fiscal 1961 is now obsolete, this section also contains authority for the subsequent use of the foreign currencies received for surplus commodities, as well as a statement that such commodities available for transfer abroad may also be made available to the maximum extent practicable to eligible domestic recipients or to needy persons in the U. S. Another section continued in force is section 502 (a) which provides authority for certain uses of foreign currency accruing under the provisions of section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, which provided for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currency.

TARIFF CLASSIFICATION. Received from the Secretary of the Treasury a proposed bill "to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions"; to Finance Committee. P. 12844



11. CIVIL DEFENSE. Received from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization a proposed bill to amend Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958 creating the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization "in order to change the name of the office established under such plan, and for other purposes"; to Armed Services Committee. p. 12844

SENATE - JULY 29

12. APPROPRIATIONS. Began debate on H. R. 7445, the Independent Offices appropriations bill, 1962. pp. 12971, 12986, 13013-20, 13021-35, 13044-7
13. FARM INCOME. Received from the Nemaha County, Kans., Farmers Union, a resolution urging "immediate steps ... to increase farm income not only for farmers sake, but for the upward effect it will have on business profits and unemployment of labor." p. 12970
14. MEATS; HAM. Sen. Neuberger criticized USDA regulations relating to labeling of ham as to added moisture content, saying "consumers desiring nonwatered hams find it increasingly difficult to purchase them with confidence. And consumers are continuing to pay ham prices for this federally inspected water." p. 13038
15. MIGRATORY LABOR. Sen. Neuberger inserted an excerpt from a resolution of the American Baptist Convention, saying "We urge that American Baptists support Federal legislation to provide financial aid to local public schools districts in meeting their responsibility to educate the children of migrants and legislation to provide adequate standards of housing for migrants and make sure that the health and welfare services of the community and State are made available to migrants." p. 13039
16. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 31. p. 13048

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

17. TAXATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Prouty inserting an article commenting on a recently completed nationwide survey of small business opinion regarding the President's tax revision program. p. A5827
18. FOOD SUPPLY. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley inserting several resolutions adopted by Kiwanis International, including a recommendation for the distribution of surplus commodities "in such a manner as will hurt the least and help the most." pp. A5836-7

BILLS INTRODUCED

19. RESEARCH. S. 2338, by Sen. Gore, to provide for the establishment of a National Science Institute, a program of scientific scholarships; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 12970-1

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:

July 31: Establishment of national milk sanitation standards, H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Agriculture (exec., on pending bills).

Budget making and national security policy, S. Government Operations.

For supplemental information or copies of legislative material referred to, USDA personnel in Washington may call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105-A.



I hope the Congress will take action at the earliest practicable date to authorize some type of national center for badly needed research.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2338) to provide for the establishment of a National Science Institute, a program of scientific scholarships, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments to House bill 7035, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.

My amendments offer the Senate an opportunity to help President Kennedy achieve the fiscal prudence in Government required to offset \$6 billion in additional defense spending, by eliminating \$277,670,000 which has been added to H.R. 7035 in excess of the President's requests.

The amendments would reduce appropriations for hospital construction and for the National Institutes of Health to the amounts which were requested by the President in his revised budget. President Kennedy requested a total of \$770,972,000 for the items in question. That was \$78 million above the amounts recommended by President Eisenhower in the January budget. The Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of \$1,048,642,000, or \$277,670,000 more than had been asked for by President Kennedy himself.

I respectfully express the hope that the President of the United States will give support to those of us in the Senate who are trying to help him achieve fiscal responsibility and fiscal prudence in our National Government in this time of emergency. Should the White House throw its powers of persuasion behind these amendments, with the assistance of the able and distinguished majority leader, I do not believe it could fail.

Mr. President, a table showing the effects of the amendments has been placed on the desks of all Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 7035

| Activity  | President Kennedy's revised request | House allowance | Senate committee allowance | Amount Senate Committee allowance exceeds President's request |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---|
| Hospital construction.....                      | \$187,972,000                       | \$187,972,000   | \$212,972,000              | \$25,000,000  |
| National Institutes of Health:                  |                                     |                 |                            |   |
| General research and activities.....            | 95,341,000                          | 119,275,000     | 140,000,000                | 44,659,000  |
| National Cancer Institute.....                  | 117,167,000                         | 125,672,000     | 160,000,000                | 42,833,000  |
| Mental health activities.....                   | 88,324,000                          | 92,182,000      | 125,570,000                | 37,246,000  |
| National Heart Institute.....                   | 97,073,000                          | 105,723,000     | 160,100,000                | 63,027,000  |
| Arthritis and metabolic disease activities..... | 68,740,000                          | 73,661,000      | 90,000,000                 | 21,260,000  |
| National Institute of Dental Research.....      | 13,633,000                          | 14,681,000      | 20,000,000                 | 6,067,000   |
| Allergy and infectious disease activities.....  | 48,322,000                          | 52,182,000      | 60,000,000                 | 11,672,000  |
| Neurology and blindness activities.....         | 54,100,000                          | 57,624,000      | 80,000,000                 | 25,900,000  |
| Total.....                                      | 770,972,000                         | 828,972,000     | 1,048,642,000              | 277,670,000   |

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has just now said.

I express the hope that the White House would put no pressure on us to get behind the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut or the amendments of any other Senator, because I believe that this is Senate business, and that we can attend to that business ourselves, and can arrive at our own decisions; and I am sure that all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—will always be on the lookout insofar as the interest and the welfare of our country are concerned.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I renew my expression of hope that the President will "give us a hand" on this matter. He has "given the Senate a hand" a good many times during this session. I have seen votes here reversed because the

President did intervene because of his anxiety to have certain proposed legislation on the spending side passed; I have in mind particularly the housing bill, regarding which we had rather dramatic evidence of that, one night, about midnight.

So I beg to differ very much with my respected friend, the majority leader. I think we need some help from the White House when we come to try to exercise some economy, as well as when the President is trying to get larger expenditures than some of us think may be necessary.

So I renew my expression of hope that we may get some assistance on these amendments, because it is a very important matter, and is a very easy and obvious way to help implement the President's repeatedly expressed desire for fiscal prudence at this time of emergency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:  
Editorial entitled "How Long?" published in the Exeter (N.H.) Newsletter on July 27, 1961.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:  
Editorial entitled "Job for the Experts," written by Jack Smyth, editor and publisher, and published in a recent edition of the Delaware State News.

By Mr. MUNDT:  
A news story concerning the address of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER at the State Convention of the Texas department of the American Legion, at Houston, Tex., dated July 28, 1961, entitled "GOLDWATER" Denounces Censorship of Military"; and  
An article written by George E. Sokolsky, published in the Washington Post of today, entitled "BARRY GOLDWATER."

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:  
Letter from the mayor of Mercedes, Tex., to the editors of the Wall Street Journal, published in the Wall Street Journal on July 25, 1961.

DEATH OF FATHER OF J. WILLIAM THEIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just now been informed of the passing of the father of a dear friend of mine, Mr. William Theis, of United Press International. At this time I wish to express my sympathy and condolences, on behalf of my family and, I am sure, on behalf of the Senate, to Bill Theis and his family on their loss. I know how much Bill Theis thought of his father; I know how devoted he was to him; and I know of the difficulties under which he labored in making trips from Washington to Pennsylvania to see his father whenever time permitted.

So at this time I wish to express my deep sympathy to Mr. Theis and his family, and to express to them, on behalf of all of us, our condolences.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is sad news. Bill Theis is a friend of every U.S. Senator. All of us join in the expression of heartfelt condolences, as the able majority leader has just now indicated, on behalf of the entire membership of the Senate. We who count Bill Theis our friend join with all his friends in sincere expressions of heartfelt sympathy in his great loss.

WISE INVESTMENTS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, vast expanses of public lands in my native Cal-



ifornia—close to half the total acreage of our State—are a tremendous national asset and treasure, as well as vital to the economy, happiness, and, in many instances, the very existence of the residents of California.

Because of peculiarities of climate and the character of terrain, a terrifying and almost constant threat hangs over much of the immense area embraced in national parks and forests. This is the hazard of fire, which the past few years has been exceedingly serious and virtually ever present because of a devastating dry cycle through which much of the West has been passing. The constant population growth and the expansion of my State warrant extraordinary measures to counter this danger.

The priceless nature of these public lands is suggested by the fact that the bulk of watersheds essential for supplying water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and domestic uses and for power production lie in or adjacent to Federal holdings. The recreational values are enormous. The timber supply and the wildlife are of inestimable value.

In the two appropriation bills which cleared the Senate and went to the President this week, were items of particular significance with relation to these great natural resources. I wish to express the gratitude of the people of California, particularly those residing in communities located in foothills below national parks and forests, those whose livelihood is greatly dependent upon preservation and utilization of timber, minerals, and recreational attractions, and those whose supplies of water and electric power are contingent upon the condition of these watersheds, for three sums of money about which I wish to comment briefly.

The Congress has seen fit to provide two funds which I had the honor of recommending in the Senate Appropriations Committee as a means of providing greater and better protection of our forests and parks. It is gratifying that the conference report on the Commerce Department appropriation bill carried \$200,000 with which the Weather Bureau can initiate a program to improve its fire-weather services in California and other Western States. It likewise is reassuring that the special fund for strengthening defenses against fires in the four forests of heavily populated southern California was raised by \$300,000, to an annual level of \$1,720,000.

The importance of these appropriations is obvious when we consider that last year upward of 200,000 acres in parks and forests were ravaged in California. Scores of these were caused by lightning, which is a prime reason for giving the Weather Bureau added tools with which to assist the Federal, State, county, and local agencies, which need all the help they can obtain, at times, to prepare for an outbreak of fires and to bring them under control as quickly as possible.

The aggregate of funds for fire prevention, fire suppression, and specialized weather service will be a wise investment. Any doubt of this can be removed

by noting that in 1960 the cost of extinguishing of blazes on Federal lands in California alone exceeded \$15 million.

The Interior Department-Forest Service money bill also carries another exceedingly meritorious item, \$975,000 for a forest fire research facility to be built at Riverside, Calif. Such a laboratory is sorely needed for studies of methods of preventing and controlling fires, the behavior of blazes, and the effect of weather, terrain, vegetation, and other factors on their occurrence and intensity. It certainly will contribute to perfection of more effective firefighting techniques and equipment. I have urged such a research facility for several years, and I am pleased to know that its construction will now go forward. It cannot help but pay large dividends in the future.

Such expenditures of public funds are in the nature of insurance of incalculable worth. The Senate is to be commended for appreciating the necessity of approving these items. They will be of inestimable benefit, not only to Californians, but directly or indirectly to all other Americans.

#### RESOLUTION ON CHINA

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a news article on the so-called Red China resolution written by Warren Duffee of the UPI and appearing in this morning's Washington Post states:

The resolution approved by the Senate was approved 16 to 0 by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this week. It was a slightly modified version of a proposal sponsored by Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD.

It had been drafted to head off an even stronger resolution offered early this year by Senator NORRIS COTTON, Republican, of New Hampshire. Critics said COTTON's proposal was so stringent it could tie the hands of President Kennedy and possibly those of future Presidents.

The last sentence referring to my original proposed Senate resolution is ridiculous.

First, it could not possibly have tied the hands of "future Presidents." Similar resolutions have been adopted by the House or the Senate or both 16 times in recent years. If they could tie the hands of future Presidents, the hands of President Kennedy would already be bound.

Second, the resolution was merely an expression of the opinion of those Senators who might vote for it. Such an expression could not tie the hands of the present occupant for the Presidency, and, on the contrary, should be of assistance to him.

Finally, the original resolution offered by the Senator from New Hampshire was a simple, direct statement, without frills or furbelows—

That it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should not recognize the Communist Chinese regime as the government of China and should oppose the seating of its representatives in the United Nations.

The criticism reported in this newspaper article, coupled with all the draft-

ing and redrafting, the whereases and wherefors which followed its introduction, shows that there must have been some basis for the fears entertained by many of us that it was desired to leave the way open for a "two-China policy" in the near future.

I hope that is not the intention of anybody, either in the Congress or in the State Department or in the administration.

I was reassured by the assertions made last night that it was not intended to leave any door open for such action in the resolution unanimously adopted.

Mr. President, in closing let me say this: The purpose of resisting the admission of Red China into the United Nations, no matter what was stated in the "whereases," is not a matter of revenge, is not a matter of antagonism because of actions against the United States or its soldiers in uniform. The purpose is to save the United Nations as an instrument for peace and order in this world.

Those who should be supporting a steadfast, resolute, adamant policy of opposition to that admission should be the liberals in this country, because the day that Red China enters the United Nations, even though as only one of two Chinese members, it would begin knocking at the door of the Security Council; and the day it enters the Security Council, the United Nations as an instrument for peace and law and order in the world will be dead.

Mr. President, I did not desire to reopen this matter. I did not say anything about my resolution. I was delighted when it was taken over, revised, proposed by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, and then carefully revised by the Committee on Foreign Relations. But in view of this newspaper statement, I felt that we should again clarify the situation, and know where we stand and know that there were no "ifs" or "ands" yesterday in the adoption of the resolution by the Senate.

#### CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN MARENGO COUNTY, ALA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senate bill 1012, to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in Marengo County, Ala., to the Greif Bros. Cooperage Corp., was considered yesterday while I was away from Washington on official business of the Senate. I had desired to make a statement indicating that the bill, as reported with amendments from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, does not violate the Morse formula.

A serious question would have been presented in this connection had the bill been reported as originally introduced, because it would have constituted Senate adjudication of a question of fact which, under the applicable statute—title 43 United States Code, section 1068-1068b—relating to Federal lands held in adverse possession under color of title which are within the province of the Secretary of the Interior.



The judge saw police files indicating the youth had given heroin to at least four others between the ages of 18 and 21. Despite this, the judge gave the offender a 1-year suspended sentence and placed him on probation.

During his probation, police, who believed he was operating a confidence racket to maintain his habit, caught him at the home of another addict. The judge finally agreed to send him to jail.

#### JAIL

In New York City, only two-thirds of those annually convicted of narcotic crimes go to jail.

In 1960, 3,500 of the 5,000 arrested in New York City were convicted. About 1,000 of these violators were sent directly back to the streets with suspended sentences and probation.

About 750 got 3-month jail terms and 1,750 received reformatory or prison sentences.

#### SICK

Many of these police court and city court judges have been persuaded that the addict, and even the addict-peddler is a sick man and should be confined in something like a hospital.

Many of them believe that prison is too harsh a place to send a sick man. Since there are only limited hospital facilities, the judges in many cases hand out only token sentences.

Many more judges are confused as to where to draw the line between the peddler who does not use narcotics and the peddler who does.

#### PROTECTION

New York State law allows the man who sells to protect himself in two ways. First, he can carry an amount small enough to preclude his being sentenced as a felon.

If he carries less than an eighth of an ounce of heroin, the harshest sentence he can receive is a year in prison and a \$500 fine.

He also may be smart enough to take limited amounts of heroin so he can, when arrested, appeal to the sympathies of the court.

State law does not recognize that many long-term addicts must sell small amounts of heroin to others to obtain money to "buy" his own narcotics.

#### OTHERS

Every addict will eventually involve four others in narcotics use, according to the U.S. Narcotics Bureau.

To some Buffalo judges, the addict is a "poor slob" deserving a break. He usually gets one, too.

For this reason, Commissioner Frank N. Felicetta and George Gaffney, agent in charge of the Federal Narcotics Bureau, New York City office, want nearly all narcotic violations taken out of the misdemeanor category.

This would take jurisdiction of narcotics cases out of the city courts and police courts. Both men also favor laws prohibiting judges from granting suspended sentences and probation in dope cases.

#### TWO CAUSES

Branding all those who possess narcotics for their own use as felons would make them liable for longer prison terms.

Felicetta and Gaffney believe this would serve two good causes. First, they reason, the addict would be out of circulation longer, lessening the number of others he could contaminate with the habit.

Second, the long jail term—those convicted of mere possession must serve 5 years before parole—would deter many from using narcotics.

But Chief City Judge Arthur J. Cosgrove admits harboring a "feeling of futility" when confronted with sentencing an addict to prison.

#### DRUG

"Those addicts are the poorest creatures on earth," he said. "They can't be portrayed as criminals. They have no money, no friends to amount to anything, no future \* \* \* only the drug."

He indicated that many judges are frustrated by the shortage of facilities to provide humane treatment for addiction.

"It seems to me," he said, "that we're only justified in sentencing these addicts when we can send them somewhere for rehabilitation."

#### EAST

"It's easy for the other fellow who stands on the other side of the bar to say: 'The judges are too easy.' Ours is the responsibility for putting these men away."

"Any time you have a judge who feels that there is a class of people beyond redemption you have a repressive judge."

Judge Cosgrove, through whose court pass about 300 addicts a year, is reluctant to sentence an addict to jail on his first arrest.

"I look on this as only one problem," he said. "There are many more immoral people who never run afoul of the law."

#### HISTORIES

Here are a few more case histories on court disposition of narcotics cases:

##### B.H.

Received suspended 6-month sentence for possession in New York City, 1950; served 6 months after convicted of possession in Lackawanna, 1950; received a 1-year suspended sentence for possession, in Buffalo, 1950; served 2 years on a Federal narcotics charge, 1952; served 6 months for possession in Buffalo, 1960; sentenced to another 6 months for possession in Buffalo, 1960.

##### PEDDLER

Known peddler, received 6 of possible 20-year sentence here on Federal narcotics charge. Began career with suspended narcotics sentence, nine arrests since for rape, extortion, and grand larceny.

##### SENTENCE

Received in 1957 a suspended city court sentence on narcotics conviction; since received 13 months out of possible 3 years in city court sentences on three narcotics charges.

##### ARRESTS

Received 1-year suspended city court sentence on narcotics charge. Police records available to Judge Ann T. Mikoll showed previous record of 21 arrests in Buffalo, Ohio, Michigan, and Connecticut.

##### RECORD

Prostitute given 6-month city court sentence for possession of instruments used to administer narcotics. Seven previous arrests for larceny, prostitution, assault, and cutting.

##### HOODLUMS

Judge Mikoll sentenced hoodlum to 90 days in jail for possession of narcotics. Records available show 15 previous arrests, 6 convictions for offenses ranging from grand larceny to sales of narcotics to drunkenness.

##### NINETY DAYS

Judge Casimir T. Partyka sentenced man to 90 days in Erie County Penitentiary; defendant had record of 21 arrests since first suspended sentence on possession of marijuana. (Law provides minimum 6 months to a year sentence on second narcotics conviction.)

#### LEADERSHIP LACKING—COORDINATOR BIG NEED IN DOPE WAR

(By Douglas Turner)

("It has been 45 years and more since we first tried seriously to control narcotics. In that whole time, we have been unable to

agree on causes, on methods, on objectives. Futility has been expressed both by officials doing nothing or by their yielding to emotional demands for so-called 'solutions' that really solve nothing"—California Corrections Director Richard A. McGee to the 1960 Governor's Council, prior to the enactment of a broad new California program to combat addiction. The 12th and last of a series.)

#### LACKING

The steady growth of the army of the walking dead is the most concrete result of the lack of an independent, powerful "take-charge man" to coordinate the State's fight against the menace of addiction.

#### NO OFFICIAL

Nowhere in State government is there an official whose sole statutory responsibility it is to:

1. Spur existing, modest State programs for treatment and research.

2. Coordinate law enforcement activity among State, city, county and Federal agencies.

3. Educate the public and the judiciary on the high cost and the nature of addiction.

4. Consolidate the nearly 70 laws dealing with addiction and see to it that the money appropriated under these laws is being properly spent.

5. Serve as an impartial clearing house for all opinions and studies on addiction, treatment and relapse of former addicts into use of narcotics.

6. Draft and press for passage of laws giving the police and the judiciary effective tools to either relieve the suffering of the addict or sweep them into institutions where they cannot contaminate others.

#### CHALLENGE

Nowhere in government is there an official charged with making order out of the State's dilatory, chaotic approach to mass addiction.

Vesting this kind of power in one man, or in one full-time group may be an awesome proposal.

But the State's mass addiction problem is a big challenge to government. There are 21,000 listed addicts in this State—2,000 more than 3 years ago. They represent nearly half the addicts in the Nation. Aside from ruining their own lives, they cost the citizens of the State \$250 million in property damage or loss.

#### BURDEN ON POLICE

The sheer size of this group has frequently imposed insuperable burdens on the State's police, courts, and prisons.

No one official, no one group has assumed even a major share of the responsibilities outlined above.

This newspaper's series on addiction has tried to show how the responsibility for curbing the growth of addiction has been passed from official to official, from agency to agency until it falls through the web of governmental fabric.

#### FOR INSTANCE

Here are some examples:

State departments of health and mental hygiene—opposed bills calling for mass treatment because of the shortage of facilities; for more than 2 years declined to spend funds on a new research center; opposed appointment of powerful director of narcotic control by Governor Rockefeller; allowed opening of small treatment centers to be delayed for more than a year.

#### LEGISLATURE

Failed to approach addiction problem on a bipartisan basis; allowed groups lobbying for various solutions to addiction to divide opinion so as to reduce the lawmaking body to the point of inaction.

(Many upstate legislators, who form a large portion of the controlling Republican membership, while not necessarily unsympathetic to the addiction problem, put narcotic law



changes far down on their list of needed reforms.)

## JUDICIARY

Fails to impose harsh sentences on addicts and peddlers as a matter of policy, partly because of lack of knowledge of the nature of addiction, inadequate probation records on addicts, and the shortage of facilities for humane treatment and rehabilitation.

Many judges believe narcotics use is not more harmful to the community than vagrancy, disorderly conduct, or running a stop sign.

For many addicts and peddlers, the consistent light sentences handed down from the bench are merely licenses to sell or use drugs.

## GAFFNEY'S PLAN

George Gaffney, Federal narcotics agent in charge of the New York City office, wants the New York Legislature to pass laws similar to those enacted in California last month, calling for longer prison terms and more treatment facilities.

"I don't necessarily believe that the addict is a sick man the way many doctors do," said Gaffney. "But if he is sick, and afflicted with a contagious disease, why aren't law enforcement officers here given powers to put these 'sick' men into quarantine where they won't contaminate others?"

He thinks all narcotic offenses should be made felonies and judges should be barred from granting probation to second offenders.

## CALIFORNIA

New York is in much the same position that California was in a year ago. Faced with a growing addiction problem, the history of "efforts to control addiction and traffic had been one of confusion and futility," according to the State's correction director, Richard A. McGee.

Then Gov. Edmund G. Brown took the dilemma by the horns and forged a many-phased, bold new program to deal with the problem.

## LACK OF LEADERSHIP

Why hasn't this happened in New York State? One Federal liaison man assigned to the New York Legislature gave this answer: "Leadership. There has been no powerful, decisive leadership on this issue."

## RESOLUTION FROM EASTERN BUSINESS TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the Eastern Business Teachers Association urging Federal assistance in purchase of equipment and supplies for business as well as other subjects now covered under the National Defense Education Act. Which I ask to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## NDEA RESOLUTION PASSED BY EASTERN BUSINESS TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

The Eastern Business Teachers Association at its annual convention in New York City, March 30, 31, April 1, 1961, endorsed National Defense Education Act support for business education by passing the following resolution:

"Whereas business trained workers are essential members of the science-engineering-business teams devoting their efforts in the interest of our national defense, and since in time of national emergency there has always been a critical shortage of competent employees in the office occupations field, and since the large majority of these job opportunities are being filled by business education graduates of the secondary schools; and

"Whereas many sweeping changes are presently taking place in business offices mandating not only a revamping of secondary business education curricula, but also requiring extensive purchases of modern business equipment and materials; and

"Whereas the rising costs of instructional materials and equipment have become almost prohibitive to the effective installation and implementation of modern programs in business education for most local school districts: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the provisions of the National Defense Education Act be extended to include the purchase of essential equipment and materials for all business education instruction in the Nation's secondary schools and those independent business schools who qualify under the act and that adequate funds be appropriated and allocated to carry out the intent of this resolution."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, H.R. 7445, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445).

## RESOLUTION ON CHINA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not yield until I finish this speech, because this matter is so delicate, so emotionally charged in the thinking of so many Americans, that I propose to exercise the privilege of making my remarks in continuity, and I shall be very glad to answer question when I finish.

Yesterday, Mr. President, I was away from the Senate, at Charleston, W. Va., where I addressed the 43d convention of the American Legion, department of West Virginia. I spoke on foreign policy topics. In view of the subject matter of this speech this morning, it is particularly fitting to insert in the RECORD, with the unanimous consent of the Senate, the speech which I made at the West Virginia American Legion Convention, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, 43D CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JULY 28, 1961

Commander Lester, Governor Barron, officers of the American Legion, department of West Virginia, and officers of the auxiliary,

legionnaires of West Virginia, their families and friends, you have paid me several much appreciated compliments by extending to me the honor of addressing you today. It is a compliment to be welcomed to Charleston by your distinguished Governor, W. W. Barron. As one from outside the State I wish to tell you that the abilities and achievements of your Governor are favorably known far beyond West Virginia. His progressive political philosophy, dedicated to the general welfare of the people of West Virginia, marks him as one of the outstanding Governors of our Nation.

It is also a compliment to have been invited to address you by your very able leader, Cmdr. Robert E. Lester. His invitation was also joined in by one of the most distinguished citizens of West Virginia, former Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson. I consider Louis Johnson to be a great American, and for years he has been one of my personal friends.

It is also a compliment to speak in West Virginia, the home State of two of my close friends in the Senate of the United States. I bring to you the cordial greetings of your two fine and able U.S. Senators, Senator RANDOLPH and Senator ROBERT BYRD. It is not political flattery but sincere and deserved commendation when I tell you that the veterans of West Virginia are represented in the Senate of the United States by two patriots who can always be counted upon to support sound veterans' legislation and support the Commander in Chief of this country in adopting whatever defense program may be necessary to combat any threat to our national security and freedom. I am proud to have Senators RANDOLPH and BYRD not only as my colleagues in the Senate but also as highly respected personal friends.

The American Legion is a name identified with freedom and with the defense of freedom, and it is an honor and a privilege to be invited to participate in this convention of the American Legion of West Virginia.

The very name of your organization indicates that you have taken up arms in defense of our country, and, in effect, have offered the most that any human being can offer his country—his life.

I do not believe that there has ever been a time in human history when liberty did not have to be paid for by each generation, only by labor and sacrifice if it was a fortunate generation, but often with human lives.

Today, the headlines and the common conversation on the street are again concerned with the defense of the Nation, and whether our freedom is again going to have to be purchased with human life.

The threat of the Communists to force the Western Powers out of Berlin is taking on a note of urgency which leads me to believe that their puppet government of East Germany is genuinely threatened by the continued existence of freedom in West Berlin.

There can be no question of whether or not we resist the Soviet effort. The Congress is already in the process of giving the President the authority he needs to increase the manpower of the Armed Forces, and to improve the capacity of our military transportation system. Just as I always have supported defense measures, I have supported this legislation.

There must not be a time when Soviet Russia, or Communist China, can be permitted to believe that a military aggression on the part of either one will go unchallenged or unresisted. It must be evident at all times that the Communist powers have nothing whatever to gain, but do have everything to lose, from an aggressive action.

As President Kennedy has put it, "The NATO shield was long ago extended to cover West Berlin, and we have given our word that an attack upon that city would be regarded as an attack upon us all." I have not the slightest doubt that the United



My Latin-American friends, and I have many of them in many countries of the Western Hemisphere, are asking why the greatest power in the world is acting like a frightened rabbit regarding Castro and his Communists.

Then the remark attributed to one of your fellow Texans that the issue now is "freedom or starvation" certainly should have received some upstairs attention, for the issue today is "freedom or slavery."

These officials who make such misleading remarks either don't know what they are saying, which I would like to believe, or they have been engulfed with the idea that, in a war with an enemy who has announced his intention to destroy you, we can win by appeasement and molly-coddling. And this is patently ridiculous.

Today, as never before, we must emphasize every facility which we possess to aid our cause in the great global struggle. Every free world statesman who ever tried to talk to a Communist has been forced to recognize a language barrier. Both sides may use the same words, but they have different meanings to each. So, while talks may sound as if some general agreement has been reached, it is not necessarily true.

This is a serious problem we have to solve. The Communists may not want to understand some of our words today, but we have something they do fully understand and which they respect. That one thing is our national strength. I mean our moral strength, and the military might to back it up. The job ahead of us is to keep that national strength so overwhelmingly powerful that the Communists will have to come to school to us to learn our meanings. They must come to learn that they cannot pervert the meaning of human dignity and turn it to their own vicious purposes.

And while we are teaching the Communists this lesson, we will keep order in the classroom with the mightiest and most versatile fighting force we have ever possessed. In an era of what would have once passed for peace, we have built a military capability greater than we have ever sent to war. True, we have fewer divisions under arms, and fewer ships and aircraft than we had at the peak of our power in World War II. But quality weapons and modern delivery systems add up to a firepower potential—yes, a destruction potential—far and away greater than we ever had to build for past wars. This is our strength in being.

This strength is fully capable of winning the decision in any war that might start in the near future, provided, of course, that such a war would be fought to win—and not underground rules of timidity giving an enemy sanctuary beyond the Yalu, or any other such line.

If any potential enemy becomes an actual one in a shooting sense, we are going to have to go in and get him, wherever he may be. And we can get him. We can get him, as I said, in the near future.

What we have to do now is to be sure we can do it whenever it may be necessary.

And to make sure of this we need more than machines. We need men of ability and vision, and now is the time to attract and to hold such men in both the civilian and military communities. I have in mind people who will bring to their tasks the same level of professional qualifications, the same unswerving loyalty, the same dedication to service as we see today in our Joint Chiefs of Staff and in our other military leaders.

Our national objectives are ill-served, as I have said, when the stature of these men is degraded. I deplore the attacks that have been made upon these men. We have always had in this country a haunting fear of a spectre we label "militarism." And we have built elaborate organizations to protect ourselves against this spectre. It is high time now that we recognize that our

military forces are vital organs of the body politic as well as essential organs of our defense. As such they should be nourished and encouraged rather than attacked and intimidated.

In conclusion, I would remind you that the President has, in speaking of those nations who would make themselves our adversaries said:

"We must not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

I am certain that every true American stands with the President in this, just as they do on the Berlin situation where he firmly restated our intention to stand up to the Communists. In this, I believe our President took the only stand that an American leader can take. And, I believe the American people are willing to make the sacrifice necessary to back it up. But this strong stand must be maintained with more than just words. There can be no pulling back. For, in this situation, if we take one backward step Europe will be lost.

Thank you.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Carolina does not think I was impatient. I merely wanted to get started with the bill. I wish to join the other Senators in complimenting the Senator from South Carolina. I think he has made a great contribution to this matter, which is of great interest to all Americans.

Mr. THURMOND. Not at all. I highly respect the Senator from Washington, and I am please to cooperate with him in any way that I can.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was thinking this discussion might continue indefinitely. We have an item in the bill for civil defense which I think indirectly involves the whole problem.

I thought perhaps we could discuss these matters on that subject.

Mr. President, I should like to read a brief statement for the Senate on the independent offices appropriation bill.

I thoroughly agree with my friend from South Dakota that we build too many houses. We must have a house to live in, to operate from against the things the Senator talks about.

The bill contains some provisions for some pretty solid bricks in the house.

The independent offices appropriation bill for 1962 covers some 23 agencies and the appropriations as reported to the Senate total \$9,098,614,500, which is an increase of \$694,516,500 over the House bill.

It should be remembered that the large bulk of this amount deals with the Veterans' Administration and with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Seventy-nine percent of this increase is in \$549 million added by the Senate

for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This amount was requested in May, after the President's message setting national goals in the aeronautics and space science fields, and Public Law 87-98 authorizing these advanced programs was approved on July 21. The committee feels that the speeding up of these programs is essential for the whole technological future of our country.

Ten percent of the increase is in \$70 million added for the public buildings and supply and stockpiling functions of GSA.

The balance of the increase is in \$26 million added for National Science Foundation, \$16 million for Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, \$13 million for Federal Aviation Agency, \$9 million for the Veterans' Administration, mostly in medical research, \$7 million for Civil Aeronautics Board, involving the helicopters, and smaller amounts for several other agencies.

The 1962 appropriations in the bill are also \$605 million over 1961, but are \$76 million below the budget estimates.

The bill contains several amounts over the budget estimates but, as I pointed out, the total is \$76 million below the budget estimates. We went over in some cases and under in others.

The amounts over the budget estimates are as follows: \$2.5 million to Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, to accelerate radiological defense equipment; \$13 million to General Services Administration, to construct 4 buildings soon to be ready for bids; \$20 million to General Services Administration, to provide Sites and Expenses funds for newly authorized buildings; \$5 million to Veterans' Administration, to make medical research \$32 million; and \$2.5 million to Veterans' Administration, to provide research facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to be waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what was the last proviso?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Provided, that no point of order shall be considered to be waived by reason of agreement to this order.

Mr. JAVITS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 20, after the word "services", to insert "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed \$6,000;"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$6,000"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "travel", to insert "excluding rental of passenger motor vehicles from General Services Administration", and in line 4, after the word "Provided", to strike



out "That the foregoing amount shall be available for not to exceed 303 positions in the District of Columbia area: *Provided further*,".

On page 3, line 21, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$6,567,000" and insert "\$5,000,000".

On page 4, line 9, to strike out "\$21,600,000" and insert "\$38,500,000".

On page 4, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$2,500,000".

On page 6, line 8, after the word "Board", to strike out "\$74,800,000" and insert "\$81,700,000", and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$6,900,000".

On page 7, line 2, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$21,029,000" and insert "\$21,669,000".

On page 9, line 16, after the word "fund", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission shall include annually, in its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget, estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts paid out of the fund by reason of the enactment of Public Law 85-465, and the Bureau of the Budget shall submit annually to the Congress estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the fund for such amounts."

On page 10, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,148,000".

On page 11, line 9, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "\$428,000,000" and insert "\$440,600,000", and in line 10, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "That total costs of aviation medicine research for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed \$1,500,000 or include in excess of 120 positions: *Provided further*,".

On page 12, line 6, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$120,000,000" and insert "\$124,577,000", and in line 11, after the word "facilities", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel".

On page 13, line 9, after the word "uniforms", to insert "purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year".

On page 13, line 18, after the word "uniforms", to insert "purchase of three passenger motor vehicles".

On page 14, line 4, after the word "airport", to strike out "\$26,100,000" and insert "\$20,100,000".

On page 14, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$12,000,000".

On page 15, line 10, after the word "only", to strike out "\$12,400,000" and insert "\$12,525,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the limitation until June 30, 1962, on the availability of the appropriation for a special ultra-high frequency television study, contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961, under the head "Federal Communications Commission", is hereby extended until December 31, 1962."

On page 16, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$10,690,000".

On page 17, line 6, after "(40 U.S.C. 521)", to strike out "\$170,000,000" and insert "\$176,000,000".

On page 18, line 3, after the word "facilities", to insert "and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from build-

ings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration".

On page 18, line 15, after the word "buildings", to strike out "\$171,600,000" and insert "\$194,456,500", and in line 18, after the word "construction", to strike out the comma and "sites and expenses for" and insert "of".

On page 19, line 5, after the word "warehouse", to strike out "Long Beach" and insert "Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor".

On page 19, after line 8, to insert: "General Services Administration stores depot, Denver, Colorado, \$5,510,000;".

On page 19, after line 17, to insert: "Post office building, Tupelo, Mississippi, \$789,000;".

On page 20, after line 10, to insert: "Federal office building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, \$20,000,000;".

On page 20, after line 12, to insert: "Post office building, Dyersburg, Tennessee, \$901,000;".

On page 20, after line 14, to insert: "Post office and courthouse, Montpelier, Vermont, \$1,258,000;".

On page 21, line 6, after the word "per centum", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That funds in the amount of \$5,601,500 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961, for a construction and alteration project at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, since abandoned as to its previously approved scope, are hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation."

On page 21, after line 12, to insert:  
"SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS  
PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 22, line 15, after the word "for", to strike out "\$3,450,000" and insert "\$3,737,000".

On page 23, line 5, after the word "items", to strike out "\$27,375,000" and insert "\$29,374,000".

On page 23, line 10, after "(5 U.S.C. 630g)", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000".

On page 23, line 24, after the word "individuals", to strike out "\$2,475,000" and insert "\$2,175,000".

At the top of page 24, to insert:

"No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State Regulatory Agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies."

On page 25, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000"; in line 9, after the word "Acts", to strike out "provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government", and in line 19, after the word "Treasury", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; into a form best suitable for stockpiling".

On page 27, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$14,268,900" and insert "\$14,864,000".

On page 27, after line 5, to insert:

"WORKING CAPITAL FUND

"To increase the capital of the working capital fund established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293), \$150,000."

On page 28, after line 22, to insert:

"Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000."

On page 30, line 11, after the word "amended", to strike out "urban planning financed through grants to State and local government agencies pursuant to title VII of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and reserves of planned public works financed through advances to municipalities and other public agencies pursuant to title VII of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended,".

On page 31, line 10, after "(40 U.S.C. 462)", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000".

On page 31, after line 15, to strike out:

"URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

"For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$450,000."

On page 32, line 21, after the word "only", to strike out "\$21,950,000" and insert "\$22,200,000".

On page 33, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$10,395,000", and in line 13, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "\$191,750,000" and insert "\$221,750,000".

On page 33, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "\$892,000,000" and insert "\$1,278,000,000".

On page 34, line 6, after the word "law", to strike out "\$116,250,000" and insert "\$249,250,000", and in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which \$20,000,000 shall be available for emergency construction of facilities in accord with section 3 of the legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year 1962,".

On page 34, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$20,000".

On page 34, after line 21, to strike out:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

"Operation and maintenance of properties

"For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective."

On page 35, line 16, after the word "services", to strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert "\$276,500,000"; in line 18, after the word "than", to strike out "\$37,600,000" and insert "\$32,200,000", and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$2,000,000".

On page 36, line 6, after the word "vehicles", to insert "not to exceed \$45,000 for expenses of travel".

On page 36, line 15, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to insert "at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem".

On page 37, line 16, after the word "service", to strike out "\$161,500,000" and insert "\$162,046,000".



On page 38, line 7, after the word "law", to strike out "\$40,700,000" and insert "\$47,053,000", and at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "\$27,000,000" and insert "\$32,000,000".

On page 40, line 22, after the word "Code", to strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$77,500,000".

On page 41, line 6, in the subheading, after the word "Loan", to strike out "Guarantee" and insert "Guaranty"; in line 7, after the word "Loan", to strike out "guarantee" and insert "guaranty"; in line 8, after the word "expenses", to strike out the comma and "but not to exceed \$120,624,000,"; in line 10, after the word "loan", to strike out "guarantee" and insert "guaranty", and at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "guarantee" and insert "guaranty".

On page 43, line 9, after the word "System", to strike out "or", and in line 11, after the word "Board", to insert "or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules".

On page 45, line 14, after "section 407", to insert "or 408".

On page 47, line 1, after "section 407" to insert "or 408".

On page 48, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,900,000" and insert "\$2,100,000".

On page 49, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$650,000" and insert "\$750,000".

On page 51, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$58,000,000" and insert "\$61,300,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That the foregoing limitation shall not apply to fees and other expenses paid by and between private parties in connection with cases processed under the Certified Agency Program."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] who wishes to speak on an item in the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the committee yielding to me at this time.

#### COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. President, the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft is a matter of far-reaching importance to this Nation's maintaining its position of world leadership in commercial aviation. I am convinced that the national interest requires aggressive exploration of the costs, technical problems, and economic factors involved. In my opinion an eventual breakthrough in commercial supersonic transport in the future is certain to come. It is essential that we conduct the necessary research to keep abreast of or ahead of other nations in the supersonic age.

Commercial aviation has made phenomenal progress in the past 20 years. This progress has been achieved within

our lifetime. We are all familiar with it. We are prone to take it for granted and fail to recognize the developments that have occurred in this important segment of the national economy.

I have some charts on display here today. One of these is entitled "The Shrinking World." Chart 1 shows the scheduled flight time of U.S. air carriers from New York to London in 1939, 1950, 1960—and projects the scheduled flight time of a supersonic transport in 1970. This is only one measure of progress of commercial aviation. It brings into sharp focus the rapid tempo of development when you note that the flight time was reduced from 24½ hours in 1939 to 14½ hours in 1950. The present schedules are 6½ hours. In approximately 20 years, travel time between these major population centers of the world has been reduced from one day to one-quarter of a day. This trend projects definitely to the 2½-hour schedule of a supersonic transport in the next decade.

The supersonic transport aircraft will open a new era in world travel. It will require less than 2 hours to span the United States and will place London only 2½ hours from New York. Throughout the world, travel time between major cities will be reduced by two-thirds. The nation developing, producing, and selling a safe and economic supersonic transport will achieve another significant milestone in commercial aviation.

We take U.S. leadership in commercial aviation for granted. We are justly proud of our country's position. The U.S. position of world leadership is universally recognized. Our preeminence is manifested by the fact that 85 percent of the civil transport aircraft in use by free world airlines in January 1960 were manufactured in the United States. These statistics seem reassuring. But they must be carefully analyzed to see if we are maintaining our position. Chart 2 reveals that of the free world airline fleet on January 1, 1960, 93 percent of the piston-engine aircraft were manufactured in the United States—only 34 percent of the turbine-engine aircraft were manufactured in our country. This is a graphic illustration that should shatter our complacency. It shows how easily a position of leadership can be lost in a competitive world to aggressive competitors. There is a definite reason for this turbine aircraft picture. In the latter stages of World War II, some of our allies carefully surveyed the future with a view to penetrating the world markets for aircraft. They wisely decided to exploit the turbine engine, and proceeded vigorously to do so. They would have been more successful had it not been for the tragic accidents which befell the Comet aircraft. These misfortunes slowed the pace of sales of this aircraft and gave our industry an opportunity to develop our very fine jet transports. These fine transports are bringing the United States back in the world markets. The forecast for 1962, based on firm orders, shows approximately one-half of the turbine aircraft in the free world fleet will be of U.S. manufacture.

The question facing us today is what the future picture will be in terms of the U.S. share of the transport market. I am sure that with adequate planning and support, this picture will be favorable to the United States. I am equally sure that unless we take aggressive action in supporting U.S. development of the supersonic transport, the picture 10 years hence will show that some other country has taken the leadership from us. The loss of this leadership is something none of us desire. We need prompt and positive action.

What does our aircraft manufacturing industry mean to the national economy? For the 4 years, 1956 through 1959, more people were employed in the aircraft industry in the United States than in any other manufacturing industry. Reduction in employment have occurred in this industry. As a result, in 1960 it occupied third place in employment among the manufacturing industries. Senators will note from chart 3 that the employment trend has been down in the aircraft industry since 1957—with a marked downward trend occurring between 1959 and 1960. All indications are that this downward trend will continue. I do not suggest that the supersonic transport is a cure for unemployment in the United States. But unemployment is a serious consideration in our national economy. The successful development of a supersonic transport will do much to provide employment in this vital industry.

The aircraft manufacturing industry is a major labor employing industry. Chart 4 illustrates this point. Senators will see that for every \$100,000 of capital investment, 22 people are employed in the aircraft industry—compared to 5½ in a large steel company, and 2 in 1 of the major oil companies.

The important questions of balance of international payments and export trade are influenced considerably by our aircraft manufacturing industry. Chart 5 shows the U.S. net balance of international payments each year from 1955 through 1960—and the relationship of the net balance of payments to the U.S. exports of aeronautical products. Senators will see that as exports of aeronautical products increased in the years 1956 and 1957, our net balance of payments showed a correspondingly more favorable position. As our exports of aeronautical products decreased in the years 1958 and 1959, net balance of payments moved in the same trend resulting in larger deficits. In 1960, our exports of aeronautical products amounted to \$1.3 billion representing 12 percent of all exported manufactured goods. The balance of payments picture failed to improve in 1960. They at least held steady at the 1959 level. It is easy to visualize the larger deficit that would have prevailed without the help of the aeronautical product exports.

Why should the Government be concerned with a supersonic transport? Industry has traditionally developed commercial aircraft within their own resources and without direct Government support. Our industry has produced the world's finest air transports—aircraft that are safe, reliable, and economical. Airlines of other countries



are forced to buy from us in order to compete successfully on the airlines of the world. The answer to this question requires an analysis of the financial resources of our leading aircraft manufacturers, and comparison of these resources with the estimated development cost of a supersonic transport. Chart 6 clearly answers this question. Four of our leading aircraft manufacturers have capital resources varying between slightly less than \$200 million to about \$275 million. These are truly giants of the aircraft manufacturing industry. As the speed, size, and complexity of aircraft increase, the development costs increase accordingly. The development costs of the DC-8 have been reported as \$112 million. This represents only nonrecurring, strictly development costs and does not include funds required for production facilities, tooling, and the like. The Douglas Co. has total capital resources in excess of \$200 million. We all know the financial problem that this company has experienced in the development and production of the DC-8. The development costs of a supersonic transport are roughly estimated at something in excess of \$500 million.

It is abundantly clear from this chart—and analysis—that private industry is not able to undertake development of supersonic transport on a timely basis within their own resources. There is another important factor in assessing industry's ability to finance this development. It is tying up capital over a long period of time before any return can be expected on the investment. Substantial amounts of capital will have to be committed to the development of a supersonic transport. The development period will run 8 or 9 years—an excessive period of time for industry to involve capital without any return. Interest charges on this invested capital in the development period impose a substantial financial burden. For example, \$250 million tied up in development over a period of 8 years at 6-percent interest would incur \$120 million in interest charges alone. This is a strong deterrent to the investment of private funds. Some of our largest companies do not commit capital funds to a program unless return on this investment can be expected to begin within 3 years. These facts are proof that the U.S. Government must assist industry in the development of this aircraft or some other country will do so. The total free world market for supersonic transport aircraft is presently estimated at something between \$2 and \$4 billion. This is adequate incentive for other countries to compete vigorously for this business.

I would like to make it clear that I am neither suggesting nor supporting a crash program for the development of a supersonic transport. Chart 7 compares the time phasing of the development schedule for the Comet turbojet transport with that of the Boeing 707 turbojet transport. Our British friends were far-sighted in their postwar decision to develop turbine-engine aircraft. I have earlier referred to their success in the world markets with these aircraft. Senators will note that the Comet was devel-

oped and produced for delivery and operation over a relatively short period of time. There was no benefit of prior development and flight experience with military aircraft of comparable size and configuration. The tragic accidents that befell the Comet give us a clear warning against a crash program to develop a supersonic transport. In contrast to this, Senators will note that the Boeing 707 transport development was preceded by extensive development and flight experience with B-47 and B-52 type military aircraft. Even with this previous experience, approximately 9 years were spent in developing, testing, and production prior to airline use for scheduled service. The result of this orderly program has been a successful heavy jet transport. Airlines of other countries must buy them in order to effectively compete on the air lanes of the free world. This experience clearly shows that the United States must plan an orderly program for the development of a supersonic transport.

The United States is in a unique and fortunate position with respect to undertaking such a development program. We have developed and have in operation a B-58 bomber which is the largest supersonic aircraft in operational use in the free world. We have under development the B-70, a large mach 3 strategic bomber, the first prototype of which is scheduled to fly in December 1962. The development of these aircraft, a number of supersonic fighter aircraft, and research aircraft, such as the X-15, provide a sound basis from which our country can logically proceed with the development of a supersonic transport. Chart 8 suggests a time schedule for an orderly development of a supersonic transport—in relation to the B-70 development time schedule. The suggested time schedule is phased to get the benefit from the B-70 program. Supersonic transport construction would not start until approximately 1 year after first flight of the B-70 prototype. Intensive study and research on problems peculiar to commercial air transports—flying at mach 3—must be started in fiscal years 1962 and 1963. Failure to start in fiscal year 1962 will lose our head start and give other countries the chance to gain the leadership in this field.

The engines for a supersonic transport add to the urgency for starting now. In the past aircraft were developed and designed to use engines which had been developed and proven in military service. Relatively minor modifications and changes were required to adapt these military engines for satisfactory use in commercial aviation. This favorable situation no longer exists. Industry and Government officials are agreed that development of a new engine specifically designed for a commercial supersonic transport is a key factor in the future success of this aircraft. In fact, the engine development will pace the overall development program.

It is fair to ask why the B-70 engine cannot be used for a transport. The engines for the B-70 are being developed and designed specifically for the

military mission. They contemplate the use of full afterburner for takeoff and transonic acceleration. The noise level, while acceptable for defense missions, will not be tolerated for commercial operation from civil airports adjacent to large centers of population. There is also the problem of transonic acceleration at sufficiently high altitudes to alleviate the sonic boom. The engine for commercial operation must be designed to provide economical fuel consumption for both subsonic and supersonic flight. All this has a major effect on engine design.

These are the major factors requiring the development of an engine specifically for a supersonic transport. This is a new situation for our aircraft industry.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, Mr. Najeeb Halaby, has been alert to this problem. On his recommendation the President has approved a request for \$12 million in the FAA 1962 budget to provide Government support to industry for analytical studies and research of problems peculiar to a commercial supersonic aircraft. This begins 2 years of intensive effort to more accurately define the technical and financial questions involved and provide the basis for further decisions in this country regarding supersonic transport development.

I am told by Mr. Halaby that the cost of the Government support for this effort should be a little less than \$50 million for the first 2 years. I heartily endorse this approach to the problem and urge the support of Senators for it.

I have emphasized so far the relationship of a supersonic transport and a technically aggressive aviation industry to our economy. Associated with the economic importance of commercial aviation to the United States, but clearly standing apart from it in the present world, is the matter of prestige. When one stands in New York, or Brussels, or Paris, or London, or Tokyo, or Berlin, and sees the world's commercial aircraft arrive and depart, he cannot but feel pride, if he is an American or be respectful of the United States—if he is a citizen of another country—from the knowledge that so many of these aircraft are American built.

The supersonic transport, particularly in view of its relation to the continuation of a virile U.S. aircraft industry, is also of the utmost importance to national security. The emergency transportation capabilities it provides would be of critical importance in both limited and general wars. The cold war significance of the capabilities of moving hundreds, if not thousands, of troops to any point in the world within a matter of a few hours, or even minutes, needs no emphasis.

Supersonic transport technology and manufacturing capabilities, complementing the B-70 program, provide an important scientific industrial backup for the military in a speed regime and portion of the atmosphere which will remain important regardless of missile and space development. It must be re-



membered that the air is a sea that comes to every man's door. To forget the military importance of the lower atmosphere because we have moved into missiles, would be as erroneous as forgetting the importance of the sea when we first moved into military aircraft.

The FAA Administrator, in studying this question, not only has the assistance and close cooperation of the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, but he also is consulting extensively with appropriate representatives of industry. He has held meetings and discussions with officials of the principal airframe and engine companies and with officials of the leading U.S. airlines. This course of action is very commendable and necessary. Full cooperation between Government and industry working together is essential to the successful solution of supersonic transport development in the United States. Although direct Government support for transport aircraft development represents a departure from past practices in our free enterprise system, I am sure that it must be done and can be done on a basis of wholehearted cooperation and joint effort between Government and industry.

The success of the U.S. aircraft manufacturers in producing transport aircraft for world markets has resulted from their demonstrated ability to produce safe, reliable, efficient and economically satisfactory transports for use by the airlines of the world. The experience indicates that the national interest will be best served by establishing the objective that U.S. industry will produce the world's first economically competitive supersonic transport possessing safety, reliability and economic characteristics at least equivalent to those of our current subsonic jets. I am firmly convinced that this is a sound national objective and urgently recommend that we proceed immediately toward the attainment of this objective.

I call attention to the House committee report, at page 7, on the pending bill, the independent offices appropriation bill, in which it is stated:

The committee has approved \$10 million instead of the \$12 million requested in a revised budget estimate for a feasibility study of the development of a civil supersonic aircraft. The study is expected to require 18 months to 2 years to complete. The committee will expect the administrator to hold down the total cost and do a complete job for not more than \$20 million.

I trust that the Senate will give approval to the program which will lay the basis for making it possible for us to analyze and understand the problems created by supersonic jet transport at the earliest possible time.

I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding to me so that I may make this address at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from California on a somewhat new item in the appropriation bill.

I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak at this time, but it

appears that the second appropriation bill, H.R. 7035, dealing with appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, which we were to discuss and vote upon later this afternoon, will not come up today. I have prepared some remarks which I wish to get into the Record today in the hope that Senators will read them before we start voting on H.R. 7035.

Mr. President, I have proposed an amendment to H.R. 7035 to give the Senate an opportunity to help President Kennedy achieve the fiscal prudence in our National Government which will be required to offset the \$6 billion additional defense expenditures he has recommended, and which the Congress will approve. The amendment will eliminate from the bill \$277,670,000 in expenditures which were approved by the Committee on Appropriations in excess of the President's requests in his revised budget.

Hearings on the bill were conducted by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the subcommittee's recommendations were ratified by the full committee of which the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is the chairman.

What I am about to say is not in criticism of either of these distinguished Senators or of any of the able and distinguished Senators who are members of the subcommittee or the full committee, for their consideration of the bill was completed before the President of the United States made his sober and impressive address to the Nation on Tuesday night concerning the Berlin crisis and our global conflict with Communist imperialism.

In that address, the President requested approximately \$3.5 billion in appropriations to bolster the Nation's military strength, and authority to call up 250,000 men in the Ready Reserves of the armed services.

Earlier this year, on May 25, the President made an unusual personal appearance before a joint session of the Congress to deliver a special message entitled "Urgent National Needs." At that time, he also called for large additional expenditures for national defense, and for space exploration.

Altogether, the President has now asked for an addition of approximately \$6 billion to the defense budget.

In the May 25 message, he stressed the need for fiscal responsibility as follows:

If the budget now increased by the needs of our security is to be held to manageable proportions—if we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar—it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards.

He appealed to Members of Congress to refrain from adding expenditures to the budget he had submitted, no matter how desirable the programs might be for which additional spending was desired.

The President, in that May 25 message, told us:

Our security and progress cannot be cheaply purchased; and their price must be

found in what we all forego as well as what we all must pay.

I have reminded the Senate of the President's words in the past and I must again stress them as we consider H.R. 7035.

As I have said, the Committee on Appropriations completed its action on H.R. 7035 before the President made his address to the Nation on Tuesday night, warning the people of the grim situation in which we find ourselves and the heavy defense burdens we must bear.

In H.R. 7035, the committee has recommended appropriations far in excess of the President's recommendations in his revised budget.

In one section of the bill, that dealing with public health services, the committee exceeded the President's revised requests by almost \$278 million.

That amount of money is almost enough to buy three Polaris submarines, armed with their ballistic missiles, to add to our retaliatory power, and thus help to prevent an attack upon us by our Communist adversaries. It is enough to buy large quantities of other military equipment and weapons systems which we need for our national security.

When the bill came to the Senate from the other body, the appropriations for public health services already had been increased above the President's revised requests.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the distinguished former Governor of my State, Abraham Ribicoff, sent a letter to the chairman of the Senate subcommittee, in which he pointed out that the bill as passed by the House contained substantially more than the President requested, and that the largest excess amount involved—\$58 million—was in the budget of the National Institutes of Health.

This budget—

The Secretary wrote, referring to the NIH budget—hearings, pages 1418–1421—

was given most careful consideration by the President in relation to other elements of the budget and a recommendation was made which would provide for substantial forward progress in the field of medical research. The recommendation took account of other competing demands upon the budget and the rapid progress which has occurred in medical research in recent years.

Speaking in more general terms about the budget of his Department, the Secretary stressed the need for fiscal prudence.

He told the committee:

The budget estimates as amended by the President represented a sound plan to permit marked improvement in the health, education, and welfare programs administered by this Department. This plan reflected a careful consideration of the need for fiscal prudence and of the proportion of the total budget resources which should be applied to health, education, and welfare activities.

Despite this appeal from the Secretary, the Senate committee proceeded to add huge sums to the public health section of the bill.



Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table which shows President Kennedy's revised requests for appropriations for certain activities, the allowance made in the bill as it passed the House, the amounts in

the bill approved by the Senate committee, and the amounts the Senate committee allowance exceeds the President's requests.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 7035

| Activity  | President Kennedy's revised request | House allowance | Senate committee allowance | Amount Senate Committee allowance exceeds the President's request |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---|
| Hospital construction.....                      | \$187, 972, 000                     | \$187, 972, 000 | \$212, 972, 000            | \$25, 000, 000  |
| National Institutes of Health:                  |                                     |                 |                            |   |
| General research and activities.....            | 95, 341, 000                        | 119, 275, 000   | 140, 000, 000              | 44, 659, 000  |
| National Cancer Institute.....                  | 117, 167, 000                       | 125, 672, 000   | 160, 000, 000              | 42, 833, 000  |
| Mental health activities.....                   | 88, 324, 000                        | 92, 182, 000    | 125, 570, 000              | 37, 246, 000  |
| National Heart Institute.....                   | 97, 073, 000                        | 105, 723, 000   | 160, 100, 000              | 63, 027, 000  |
| Arthritis and metabolic disease activities..... | 68, 740, 000                        | 73, 661, 000    | 90, 000, 000               | 21, 260, 000  |
| National Institute of Dental Research.....      | 13, 933, 000                        | 14, 681, 000    | 20, 000, 000               | 6, 067, 000   |
| Allergy and infectious disease activities.....  | 48, 322, 000                        | 52, 182, 000    | 60, 000, 000               | 11, 678, 000  |
| Neurology and blindness activities.....         | 54, 100, 000                        | 57, 624, 000    | 80, 000, 000               | 25, 900, 000  |
| Total.....                                      | 770, 972, 000                       | 828, 972, 000   | 1, 048, 642, 000           | 277, 670, 000   |

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the total of the excess is \$277,670,000.

My amendment, Mr. President, would simply cut back the funds provided for these activities to those requested by President Kennedy, and thus accomplish a savings in the bill of \$277,670,000.

Mr. President, no appropriations have more appeal than those made to help the sick, the halt, and the blind, and for research to discover cures for the crippling and killing diseases that afflict mankind.

It is difficult to offer an amendment to reduce appropriations for these activities which have been recommended by the committee, and difficult to vote for such an amendment, simply because of the emotional factor and the fear of being thought hard-hearted.

But, Mr. President, there comes a time when our words about the need for fiscal prudence and for a curtailment in non-essential expenditures must be followed by deeds.

I believe that time has been too long delayed, and we must face the issue now.

Mr. President, the President of the United States is a compassionate man, and so is the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. They are concerned, as are all Senators, with helping the sick, the lame, the halt, and the blind, and are anxious to provide enough funds for this purpose, and for the necessary research which can lead to better health for all our people.

In their judgment, the amounts that they have recommended are ample, and the additions proposed by the committee are not needed. An adequate program—indeed, a generous program—can be had without the committee's additions.

Mr. President, I respectfully repeat the hope I expressed earlier that the President of the United States will give support on this occasion to those of us in the Senate who are trying to help him achieve fiscal responsibility and fiscal prudence in our National Government in this time of emergency. Should the White House throw its powers of persuasion behind my amendment, with the

assistance of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], it will not fail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Secretary Ribicoff from which I have quoted may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, May 22, 1961.

Hon. LISTER HILL,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The House of Representatives has completed action on H.R. 7035, the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies appropriations bill for 1962. The House action effected a number of changes in the budget estimates, as amended, involving increases of \$82.8 million and decreases of \$34.6 million and resulting in a net increase of \$48.2 million above the estimates approved by President Kennedy.

The budget estimates as amended by the President represented a sound plan to permit marked improvement in the health, education, and welfare programs administered by this Department. This plan reflected a careful consideration of the need for fiscal prudence and of the proportion of the total budget resources which should be applied to health, education, and welfare activities.

In reviewing these recommendations and exercising its judgment, the House approved additional resources for several meritorious activities and, at the same time, recommended some reductions in the President's estimates. The House action can be viewed basically as an endorsement of the President's recommendations since the net addition of funds is not in proportion to the total, a major departure from the President's proposals. Nevertheless, this would involve the expenditure of substantial sums in excess of the President's budget.

In order to assist the Senate in its consideration of the appropriations bill, the several operating agencies are preparing specific statements of the effects of the House action.

I have carefully reviewed the impact on program operations of the reductions imposed by the House. I am requesting the Senate to restore funds reduced by the House in only a few cases where the decreases would in my opinion impair effective operations. There are five items of reduction made by the House which I strongly urge the Senate to restore in whole or in part. The restoration requested amounts to \$2,337,000. These items are discussed in the following paragraphs.

#### DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Reductions made by the House are \$1 million for national defense fellowships and \$350,000 for institutes for counseling and guidance personnel. Restoration of one-half of the former cut is requested as well as all of the latter reduction.

The graduate fellowship program authorized by title IV of the National Defense Education Act is making a significant contribution toward strengthening programs of advanced study in institutions of higher education and is encouraging graduate students to prepare for college teaching. These are worthy efforts to prepare our colleges and universities to meet the demands of rising enrollments and the need for increasing numbers of highly trained individuals in every field of learning. Current estimates indicate that the total amount of the budget request cannot be used for the fellowship program since the number of fellows who drop out of the program is running somewhat higher than originally estimated. Since under existing legislation substitute awards cannot be made to replace dropouts, the full needs of this program can be met with an appropriation of \$22,262,000, an increase of \$500,000 over the House allowance.

Institutes for counseling and guidance personnel as authorized by title V, part B, of the National Defense Education Act provide Federal assistance to institutions and individuals to promote the improvement in qualifications of individuals who are engaged in counseling and guidance in secondary schools or who are teaching in those schools and are preparing to engage in counseling and guidance. This program complements other provisions of the National Defense Education Act and plays an important part in the whole effort to insure that the youths of the country receive the maximum training of which they are capable. We cannot as a Nation afford to relax our efforts to provide the best possible counseling and guidance services for secondary school students at a time when so many able students are not fully utilizing their talents. There is every indication that the full amount of the budget estimate can be used effectively for these institutes.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The House reduced the amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Education" by \$500,000; and according to the report of the Appropriations Committee, this reduction was to be applied primarily to the additional positions requested and to related expenses. This reduction would mean the elimination of 38 of the requested positions and would curtail other planned activities in the fields of international education and statistics and research. President Kennedy has highlighted the importance of the Federal Government's leadership and assistance in the field of education both in his special message to the Congress on American education and in his budget amendment requesting an additional \$1.9 million above the budget estimate previously submitted for the office. At the present time there is a heavy responsibility on the Federal Government to increase the range and depth of its leadership and services in order to assist States, localities, and higher educa-



tional institutions to develop high quality educational programs and to help make them available to increasing numbers of students. We would fail to live up to this responsibility were we to lag further behind in such critical areas as the improvement of the timeliness, comprehensiveness, and quality of educational statistics or in efforts to improve the teaching of English and to identify and encourage maximum effort on the part of talented youths.

#### GENERAL HEALTH GRANTS

A reduction of \$820,000 was made by the House in the estimate for the general health grants to States administered by the Public Health Service. This represented the total increase requested for 1962. These grants are available for expenditure under State plans approved by the Surgeon General for those areas of health services which the States themselves have identified as worthy of support; and, therefore, these grants provide an important supplement to the categorical grants in the health field. These funds which help support the basic operation of State and local health departments are frequently used to inaugurate, support, and improve programs of preventive health services. Denial of the proposed increase would seriously hamper plans to stimulate the extension and improvement of State and local health programs to newer fields, primarily in the area of radiological health.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The House provided \$79,000 less than was requested for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance." Although this reduction is small, its effects are important. In 1962, the Bureau will have the far-reaching responsibility of protecting the Federal interest in the expenditure of over \$2 billion of Federal funds. At the same time the Bureau will attempt to provide consultative services and policy guidance to the States in the development of their programs. Viewed against the magnitude of these programs and responsibilities, the staff of the Bureau is relatively small.

Furthermore, since the 1962 estimate for this item was submitted to the Congress, legislation providing aid to dependent children of unemployed parents has been enacted. Also, provision was made for Federal participation in foster family care for children who are removed from their homes through court action. The same legislation increased Federal participation in the payment of vendor medical care payments and in grants to States for training of public welfare personnel.

In order to implement the new legislation, an amendment to the 1962 budget for additional funds is currently under consideration in the executive branch. To reduce the budget currently pending before Congress in the face of the additional responsibilities resulting from the newly enacted legislation is inconsistent with the additional demands which are being made upon the Bureau. Consequently, the restoration of the \$79,000 reduction proposed by the House as requested.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION

Elimination of 20 of the additional requested positions would be necessary if the House action in reducing the request for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration" were to be sustained. Eighteen of these positions were requested to augment the resources of the regional director in working with the broad scope of the Department's programs in the field, particularly in subject matter areas which cut across agency lines such as rural development, migratory labor, and urban area assistance. An ever-increasing volume of interpretative and factual materials dealing with such subjects

must be gathered and analyzed in the regional offices. Failure to provide these positions would impair the effectiveness of the regional directors in providing consultative services to Governors, other public officials, and community and voluntary groups. The remaining two positions are needed for the State merit systems program to cope with increased workloads associated with the 1960 Social Security Act Amendments, especially those involving merit systems requirements for the administration of programs of medical care for the aged.

With respect to the increases amounting to \$82.8 million proposed by the House, I have already commented on the overall relationship of the House action to the President's budget and the importance of fiscal restraint and of maintaining a proper relationship among the many demands of the several departments and agencies. In addition to these general observations, I would like to comment on certain of the specific increases proposed by the House.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The largest increase—\$58 million—is in the budget of the National Institutes of Health. This budget was given most careful consideration by the President in relation to other elements of the budget and a recommendation was made which would provide for substantial forward progress in the field of medical research. The recommendation took account of other competing demands upon the budget and the rapid progress which has occurred in medical research in recent years. I urge that you take account of these considerations as you proceed with the budget of this Department. If, despite these factors, you should conclude that the additional sums included by the House should be retained, we shall, of course, see that they are administered as effectively as possible.

#### GRANTS FOR CANCER RESEARCH FACILITIES

The House provided \$5 million for non-matching grants for construction of cancer research facilities. The administration has given thorough consideration to health research facility needs. The budget requests \$30 million for grants for health research facilities under existing authority that expires on June 30, 1962, and draft legislation has been submitted to the Congress by the administration that would extend this program for an additional 3 years and would increase the authorization for this program to \$50 million. Under the administration's proposal Federal grants would be required to be matched dollar for dollar by applicant institutions. In addition, authority is sought to authorize construction of facilities directly or by grant without matching requirements when the facility is designed to serve a national or regional objective. The House action provides no such criteria but instead authorizes a portion of the applications for cancer research facilities to be fully funded by the Federal Government while the remainder could only be supported on a 50-50 matching basis. Great inequities are possible under these circumstances unless the legislation identifies a basis for determining eligibility for nonmatching grants. Without such an expression of public policy by Congress, a few institutions could receive the benefit of full financing of their facilities without a clear means of distinguishing them from those institutions not receiving this benefit. It is therefore recommended that this provision be deleted from the bill.

#### GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A \$10 million increase was made for grants for the construction of hospital research facilities. This additional sum is intended to aid in the construction of experimental hospitals which may hold promise of reducing operating costs in respect to intensive treatment. While this idea may have merit,

this Department has not had adequate opportunity to study the full implications of this approach. It is recommended, therefore, that the Department be given the opportunity to review it very carefully and, if it is found to be sufficiently meritorious, funds could be included in the 1963 budget.

#### AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER UP TO 5 PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE FUNDS

One of the selected number of amendments made by President Kennedy to the 1962 budget was to request authority to permit the Secretary to transfer funds among administrative expense appropriations, provided that no appropriation could be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent. As I stressed in my testimony before the subcommittee, this would be an extremely valuable tool in assessing the programs of the Department, by determining the degree to which they are accomplishing the purposes intended by Congress and the extent to which they are being administered efficiently and economically. During the course of the hearings, numerous areas were identified as being the types of needs or activities which could be appropriately handled under the transfer authority requested. In an organization the size of this Department, which will involve the expenditure of over \$4 billion in 1962 and a staffing of over 66,000 employees, some flexibility in administration is essential. The authority requested would be used sparingly, and I strongly urge its inclusion in the bill.

#### APPROPRIATION STRUCTURE

The House in acting on the 1962 appropriations bill made a number of changes in the appropriation structure. These changes were for the most part the establishment of separate appropriations for each of the major activities of the community health and environmental health programs of the Public Health Service. This practice of giving each program and major activity a separate appropriation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is contrary to the trends with respect to all other departments. I am informed that there has been a concerted effort between the Congress and the executive branch to consolidate appropriations throughout the Government and to thus minimize central fiscal control operations, simplify reporting, and consolidation of national reporting, and to make the budget document shorter and more readily understood. The budget for the Department included an appropriation structure that was more nearly in conformity with the Government-wide practice and grouped the activities of certain major organizations into a single appropriation but with more complete and meaningful breakdowns by activity than heretofore. The House action provides more separate appropriations for this Department than exists in any other department. It is therefore recommended that the appropriation structure proposed in the budget for the Public Health Service be substituted for the House proposal.

Taken together, these requested amendments will in my judgment strengthen the ability of the Department to serve the American people in fiscal year 1962. Should you or the committee desire any further information concerning these amendments, we will be happy to furnish it at once.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,  
Secretary.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. KEFAUVER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no Senator can hold the floor and still sit in his chair. That is in the teeth of all the rules of the Senate. I do not deny



the right of the Senator from Tennessee to be recognized, if he wishes to be, but I cannot stand by and see established a precedent that a Senator can hold the floor while he is sitting in his chair. That is in the very teeth of everything the rules of the Senate provide for. I am perfectly willing to defer to the Senator from Tennessee, but no Senator can hold the floor and at the same time be in his chair, except by unanimous consent.

**DEATH OF SILLIMAN EVANS, JR.,  
PUBLISHER OF THE NASHVILLE  
TENNESSEAN**

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am most shocked and distressed to learn of the death of Silliman Evans, Jr., publisher of the Nashville Tennessean. He passed away at his home near Nashville this morning.

The passing of this outstanding young man at the age of 36 is a terrible loss to the people of my State of Tennessee and to the Nation. It is a tremendous personal loss to me.

Silliman Evans, Jr., was one of our very best and most valuable citizens and my close personal friend. He was a man of much courage and a great liberal leader whose direction of one of the Nation's greatest liberal newspapers will be sorely missed. His wide circle of friends included many of our colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

Just as did his distinguished father, Silliman Evans, Sr., he championed many progressive causes and gave leadership throughout the State of Tennessee to what was just and right.

Silliman Evans, Jr., did not stop at this worthy task. He actively worked for the principles in which he believed in the Democratic Party. His contribution to the Democratic advisory council was invaluable. He was a close personal friend of Vice President JOHNSON. His service to his ideals and his Nation as a member of the Vice President's Committee on Racial Equality were just beginning when death intervened.

What Silliman Evans, Jr., has done and stood for will live long as a monument to his great qualities and abilities. It will serve as a foundation in the years to come for all those who shared his beliefs and worked for the betterment of our Nation and its every community. To his wife, Frances, his mother and all his family and associates on the Tennessean, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I join in the expression of distress and regret made by my distinguished senior colleague upon the untimely passing in Tennessee earlier today of Silliman Evans, Jr. Mr. Evans' range of interest was national in scope; and the scope of his service ranged from service to individuals, to local programs of progress, to the interests of the State of Tennessee, the Nation, and, indeed, the free world.

Cut in the mold of his late father, whose name he bore, Silliman Evans, Jr., had a heart that was true. His record

has been one of service to his fellowmen; one of service to causes for progress.

As a publisher, he wrote his mark as a progressive, courageous publisher of a liberal, progressive, democratic newspaper. His friends encompass the leaders of our Nation and, as my colleague has said, many Members of this body.

But his friendships were not confined to those occupying exalted status. Many men of lowlier walks of life claimed him as their personal friend; and indeed they had every right to do so, for his very impulse was for the betterment of the mass of mankind.

The passing of Mr. Evans is untimely at so young an age. I wish to join with my colleague in the extension and expression of regret and sympathy to Mr. Evans' widow, Mrs. Fannie Evans; to his mother, Mrs. Silliman Evans, Sr.; and to his only brother, Amon Carter Evans.

This expression of sympathy goes also to his associates, his close personal friends, in the publication of a great newspaper.

In the passing of Mr. Evans, the Nation, the State of Tennessee, Nashville, Tenn., and the Nashville Tennessean, as well as his family and his friends, have suffered a great and irreparable loss.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished Senators from Tennessee in expressing regret at the untimely passing of Silliman Evans, Jr. It was my pleasure to know his father for many years as a very fine, vigorous, able newspaper publisher and editor. Following his death, I saw his son and namesake take over that newspaper, a newspaper, by the way, which circulates widely throughout my section of Alabama.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Silliman Evans personally. I have long watched his work, and I have seen how he has attained effective leadership not only in the newspaper world, but in movements of every kind that worked for the good of the particular area which he was serving.

I join with both the Senators from Tennessee in expressing regret and extending sympathy to the loved ones of Mr. Evans.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I join with the Senators from Tennessee and the Senator from Alabama in expressing deep regret at the passing of Silliman Evans, Jr. His father and he himself were friends of mine for many years. We shall all miss him. He was an able publisher, a good friend, and a great American.

I express deep sympathy to Mrs. Evans and the rest of the family.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I, too, had the great privilege of knowing Silliman Evans, Sr., and also Silliman Evans, Jr. I appreciate the kind things which have been said by the Senators from Tennessee, as will others who will mourn the loss of this fine young man, just as we mourned the passing of his father.

I hope the Senator from Tennessee will convey to the members of the family of Mr. Evans my personal regret at the great loss the Nation has suffered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall certainly do so.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I join with the distinguished Senators from Tennessee in their expressions of regret at the untimely passing of this able and distinguished young American at the early age of 36.

The people of my State are proud of the fact that Silliman Evans was a native of Texas, having been born at Fort Worth, although his most notable service was in Tennessee, where, as editor of the Nashville Tennessean his influence was widespread, not only in Tennessee, but throughout the Nation, as well.

Mr. Evans was a great influence, particularly in my State; and while in the shock of the passing of this young and brilliant leader partisan politics have not been mentioned, I believe I would be remiss if I did not mention his political influence in my State.

He was an ardent Democrat. I have been acquainted with him for about 9 years. He was a great protagonist of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], when he was urged by his friends to seek the Presidency; and he was also a great supporter when the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee was a candidate for the Vice Presidency.

Mr. Evans was one of the bulwarks of the Democratic Party during its days of defeat and its darkest days, when some of its friends were rather reticent and not very outspoken in its defense.

Mr. Evans' record of service for the welfare of the country went beyond party lines. Most of all, he worked for the welfare of the people and sought to use instrumentalities which would bring about the great advances which he wished to be made in their behalf.

Mr. President, the loss we have suffered transcends party lines. It is a national loss; and it will be felt keenly in my State, which is proud of the honor of having been the place of birth of this great American.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with my distinguished colleagues from Tennessee [Senators KEFAUVER and GORE] in expressing my deep sorrow in the passing of Silliman Evans, Jr., and my sympathy to his family. Mr. Evans' contributions were many and



varied, and we were all better off because of him.

His courage and sagacity were extraordinary, his perception of events was penetrating, and his loyalty to his State and country was unquestioned.

We will all miss him because we valued his fine friendship, his sound advice, and his unfailing understanding.

To his family, Mrs. Mansfield and I extend our deep sympathy in their loss.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join with my able colleagues from Tennessee, and from other States, in expressing my deep regret over the passing of Silliman Evans, Jr., publisher of the Nashville Tennessean.

I knew Mr. Evans' father, Silliman Evans, Sr., and his fine son personally. Their leadership in many causes of justice were always an inspiration to me.

Silliman Evans, Jr., was never afraid to take a courageous and dedicated stand in behalf of a principle or a program in which he believed, even though such a position might have been unpopular at the moment.

He was not afraid to make a personal contribution to politics, either. His belief in and his action for the Democratic Party set an example in which any citizen might well be proud.

Men of stature and ability, of courage and action, such as Silliman Evans, Jr., are too rare in our life today.

His untimely death is a serious loss to the political and social scene of our Nation. His place will be most difficult to fill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Washington in yielding this amount of time.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, when the independent offices bill was in the committee and when we were engaged in marking up the bill, I proposed an amendment to the part of the bill which affects the appropriations for the Civil Aeronautics Administration; I refer to the part which has to do with the subsidy which is granted for helicopters.

It so happens that in the United States there are three helicopter companies which have been receiving a direct subsidy since 1954; and prior to that time they received payments for flying the mails. Those three companies were located in New York City, Chicago, and Los Angeles; and since 1954 they have received an outright subsidy of more than \$36 million, and the payment of even more than that for flying the mails.

Over the last several years there have been pending a large number of applications from helicopter companies in other cities, who have been seeking to share in this subsidy. But the Civil Aeronau-

tics Board has confined it to these three companies, and would not even permit a hearing to be held on the applications which were filed in connection with other cities. For instance, certain plane service which originates in the Capital City of Washington goes from Friendship Airport, and others go from the National Airport; but no helicopter service is being installed to transport passengers from one airport to the other, although these three companies have continued to receive the subsidy over the years.

In the committee, I proposed an amendment to the effect that not more than 20 percent of the sum allowed for helicopters—which, I state parenthetically, is \$6,900,000 for next year—should be paid to any one helicopter operator in any one year. I proposed that amendment in an effort to see to it that other cities have a chance, finally, to receive part of this subsidy.

In passing, I may say it is the rawest subsidy that is paid by our Government. To my mind, there is less justification for paying helicopter companies a subsidy for transporting passengers between cities than there is for any other subsidy on the books. But the amendment was defeated by a narrow margin in the committee.

I intended to bring up the amendment on the floor of the Senate, and I served notice that I intended to do so. But after considering all aspects of the matter, I decided not to offer the amendment on the floor. I took that position for the reason that I find in the statement by the House committee the following:

This is the last year the committee plans to recommend funds for subsidy for helicopter operation, and the amount in 1962 for this purpose has been reduced from the \$6,900,000 budget estimate to \$5 million, and earmarked in the bill at not to exceed this amount. The total amount of the subsidy paid out since 1954 to the three helicopter companies will be more than \$36 million, including the reduced amount included in the bill for 1962.

I may say the Senate committee voted to restore that reduction, and voted to make the appropriation, \$6,900,000, the full amount of the budget estimate.

The Senate committee discussed the matter at some length. I shall not read all the record of that discussion, but it is said that the committee is strongly of the opinion that the helicopter subsidy should be ended at the earliest opportunity, although the Senate committee does defend the helicopter subsidy. But the committee does say that the subsidy should be ended at the earliest possible opportunity.

I have decided that it would be better to let the matter be, this year, rather than place a limitation on the amount to be paid to these companies. If my amendment were to be adopted, thus requiring that not more than 20 percent of the subsidy could be paid to any one company, the result would be to bring other helicopter companies into operation; and then, next year, instead of being confronted with powerful forces, which sometimes are called lobbies, representing New York, Chicago, and Los

Angeles, defending the helicopter subsidy and requesting even larger amounts, representatives of several other cities would no doubt make similar requests. So I have decided that it would be better to let the matter stand as it is, this year, rather than attempt to reduce this amount now, even though in my opinion it is a complete, unadulterated fraud, as carried in this bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am in complete agreement with the distinguished Senator from Georgia in regard to this subsidy. May I point out that on page 10 of the report we find set out an item of \$12 million for a commercial supersonic mach 3 airplane. The House reduced the amount to \$10 million; but the Senate committee has recommended the restoration of the \$2 million reduction, so the amount remains at \$12 million.

As the distinguished Senator from Georgia knows, those of us who serve on the Armed Services Committee to the best of my knowledge, are unanimous in agreement that we should develop a military airplane with a mach 3 capacity.

The Department of Defense says it does not plan to use additional appropriated funds for a military mach 3 airplane. But at the same time we are going to start a broad, new development, requiring the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars to develop a commercial airplane, and this at the same time we are making a decision not to develop as a weapons system a military airplane of comparable speed. When I asked what amount this airplane would ultimately cost, I was informed that cost would be between \$500 million and \$700 million.

If this goes through, commercial travelers will be able to fly from London to New York in 2½ hours; but our combat aircraft crews will not have planes of comparable performance.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that it is difficult for me to understand the mental operations of the Budget Bureau which would approve the expenditure of \$12 million as a downpayment on \$400 million or \$500 million for the development of a supersonic passenger plane, but would resist, every step of the way, the efforts that we have been making, to obtain appropriations for a military plane which would be supersonic.

The defense of the United States today, in my mind, is the one paramount objective, or should be the one paramount objective, of every branch of Government; and here we have the same Budget Bureau that approved this appropriation, knowing in the end it would involve perhaps \$600 million or \$700 million before it was completed for commercial supersonic purposes, bitterly resisting, and impounding and refusing to spend, funds we have appropriated in an effort to insure that the young man-



hood of America will have a fighting chance to return after having delivered their payloads on the cities of our enemy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to again associate myself with the able remarks of the Senator from Georgia. The figure now for the B-70 is considerably less than the figure the previous administration recommended for this airplane. The Eisenhower administration recommended \$358 million. This administration recommends \$220 million. To the best of my knowledge, all the committees involved in the Senate believe this figure should not be reduced from \$358 million, in fact, but should be increased to \$448 million, so we can get the most modern manned combat aircraft as quickly as possible.

At the same time this is being opposed by the Department of Defense, as the able Senator from Georgia has already pointed out, we now have the first entrance of the camel's nose under the tent, only \$12 million. At the same time they tell us that, if this program goes through, it will cost between \$500 and \$700 million to subsidize the complete development of a commercial airliner, at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not want to prolong this discussion, but I will say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that we read and hear on every hand the importance of undertaking to impress Mr. Khrushchev that we mean business, and that we are serious in our determination to resist any further aggression from the Soviets against our country or against any allies we are committed to defend. I am sure Mr. Khrushchev will be seriously impressed with our determination to wage war to the hilt when he sees the Bureau of the Budget approving expenditures for a commercial airliner, but denying one dollar for future development of manned aircraft.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Georgia states the case better than I.

If we in this body have the right to draft young men off the farms and from the cities when there is no shooting war going, we have the duty at the same time to give them the best equipment and best training in order to give them the best chance of returning. I am more interested in that aspect of it than in improving the commercial ability to travel rapidly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not say that I would disagree with what the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Missouri have had to say, but I do not want any implication that the Appropriations Committee went into this question blindly. This was a recommendation of the Space Committee of the Senate, of which all three of us are members. It was unanimously decided, so far as I know, that we start on this item in the space appropriation approved by the Budget. Our committee acted only on that basis.

I was busy with the independent offices bill when the Space Committee held hearings on this matter. The Senator

from Georgia heads the Committee on Armed Services. I read the report. I assume the testimony was quite conclusive in the Space Committee; otherwise the action would not have been unanimous.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Although on the Space and Aeronautical Sciences Committee, when I found out about this in detail, I went to the head of the Federal Aviation Agency and protested this; and said, "In my opinion, you could not make the plane with \$500 million or \$700 million." The FAA said they were planning to utilize technical information from the B-70 program and that was why they could do it for from \$500 million to \$700 million.

I do not think NASA is too strong for this program, although they signed it.

I want to go on record with the chairman of the committee that I have now made my protest about this, although I, too, with him, voted for it in committee. At that time I did not have the details.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Georgia put his finger on it when he said that this is a matter we had better look at pretty carefully.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not criticizing this appropriation bill. I was merely pointing out the inconsistency in approving this expenditure and strongly resisting the development of a supersonic military aircraft.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is my point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with that. The Bureau of the Budget sent this request to Congress, and the committee acted upon it. The FAA is the managing agency, but it was the space agency that developed it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I heartily agree with what the Senators from Georgia and Missouri have said. When the matter came up in the committee about raising this amount by \$2 million, I think I raised the question, or some Senator did, and it was my understanding that we would not go forward with the B-70, as I knew we were going—

Mr. SYMINGTON. Could I ask the able Senator, is this the Defense or Space Subcommittee?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; it was the Independent Offices Subcommittee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am not on that subcommittee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. So there is a certain part of the development of a commercial plane that cannot be ascribed to the development of a military plane, and this smaller amount was to develop those facilities which would be practical for commercial purposes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is a smaller amount.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. \$12 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. According to those who are the primary advocates, the plane will cost between \$500 million and \$700 million. This request is just for a preliminary study toward the commercial plane. At the same time, we

decide not to make the military plane as a complete weapons system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I went forward with this, as one member of the committee, because I knew, from the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriation Subcommittee on Defense, we would not go forward with the B-70. I voted for this item because this was on the commercial side of research and development, rather than on the military side.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator, as a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Department Appropriations, would like to offer an amendment to eliminate the money, I assure him I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To eliminate the whole \$12 million?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes. The Bureau of the Budget does not approve the additional money we appropriated for the military aircraft, the B-70, which everybody on the committee believes we should have, after years of study. But the Bureau of the Budget recommends, and we are asked to approve, money for a commercial plane.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We approved the \$448 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But we understand the administration has no intention of spending all of it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If that is true, I would agree with the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I remember, they told us they did not expect to spend more than \$220 million of the \$448 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Secretary of Defense made a statement to our committee. I do not know whether the Senator was present. The Senator from Georgia has a very good memory. I believe the Secretary said he did not think he could spend all of this money, practically.

Mr. SYMINGTON. All of what money?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All the \$448 million. I think he stated that before.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not remember that. I understood that the Department was not going ahead with the B-70 as a weapons system. In fact, this administration cut from \$358 million to \$220 million money for this plane the previous administration recommended this year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If that is all true, and the Senator is worried about this, if he will offer an amendment to eliminate the \$12 million from the bill, I shall be glad to vote for the amendment. The Senator is a member of this committee. I am not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the \$448 million does not go through, that is all we can do. We cannot compel the administration to spend money. All we can do is appropriate the money. If the money is not spent this year, or if the development of the B-70 does not go forward, then I certainly believe the money in question should not be provided.



Mr. SYMINGTON. The difference between the \$220 million and the \$448 million is the difference between planning to make three prototypes, which are not weapons systems, and planning to make military aircraft.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I read the following:

The technical feasibility of a civil supersonic aircraft is established by U.S. research and experimental and military aircraft. The problem is to assure development of a civil supersonic aircraft that has the safety, reliability, and economic characteristics required for satisfactory commercial service. Analytical studies and research by Government agencies and industry are required to advance the "state of the art" to provide an adequate technical basis for a decision that the required safety, reliability, and economic characteristics can be achieved.

That is the basis on which I voted for the \$12 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I understand my friend from Massachusetts. I understand what was stated. We have already spent some money on the B-70, with the idea that it would go on and become a complete weapons system. Now we understand it will not be a weapons system.

This \$12 million represents the first camel's nose under the tent in a program of \$700 million for Government subsidy of a commercial airliner. I do not think we should be subsidizing a commercial airliner in this fashion, when we are denying the military people a military plane of comparable performance characteristics.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are not subsidizing anybody.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to cross up the chairman of the committee, but I say to the Senator from Missouri that so far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly willing to strike out the whole amount and take the problem to conference.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If any Senator wishes to offer an amendment to strike out the money, to put military matters ahead of commercial matters, I would vote for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I point out to the Senator from Missouri that NASA has \$8.5 million for this development under the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I understand that. That raises the figure to \$20.5 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But the NASA people are less interested than that \$8.5 million would imply.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think there was ever any illusion in the committee that, if we went ahead with the development of the B-70, it would not cost many millions of dollars more. No one is suggesting that.

This was a step involving what the Senator from Massachusetts read. The understanding was that the administration and the Bureau of the Budget had approved both items with regard to proceeding with the B-70 program. I think everybody understood that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator happen to know what the total market for this commercial airliner would be if

the Government subsidized it through to say \$700 million?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that is stated in the testimony. I think the testimony showed there were approximately 100 aircraft involved.

Mr. SYMINGTON. So all of those charts involve about 100 to 200 aircraft at the most?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to have the testimony placed in the Record. I think the figure is approximately that. The Senate hearings include justifications which state:

Due to the tremendous productivity of such an aircraft, the free world market is limited to probably 200 aircraft. The first country to develop a safe, reliable, and economically competitive supersonic transport aircraft will undoubtedly capture this free world market.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think the Senator is correct. I believe the figure was 200, including the foreign possibilities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Possible foreign sales.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes. The idea that such an amount would revolutionize favorably the economy in any part of our country, I think is not borne out by the possible future business.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think so at all. I do not think that has much to do with what we are discussing now.

This is, surely, away ahead in the future. I understand that the aeronautical engineers say they have not even solved the noise problem yet on any of these supersonic, high-speed aircraft.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, would the chairman of the committee offer an amendment to at least wait until next year before we put up money for a commercial airliner with a speed of mach 3?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I could not do that without consulting all the members of the committee. The committee voted for this item. This is the budget amount. The NASA item is included, also. Any Senator who wishes to do so can offer an amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I offer that amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Missouri can do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to eliminate this \$12 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest, in all fairness, that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is vitally interested in this subject, and he ought to be present. Other Members of the Senate also are interested, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a minute? I have an amendment which I should like to discuss. The Senator from California could be reached in the meantime.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not hear the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In view of the fact that the hour is growing late, I should like to make some remarks about my amendment. Would the chairman of the committee be willing to defer the

suggestion of the absence of a quorum so that I could present my amendment? The Senator from California could be found and brought to the Chamber.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think all Senators ought to be present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Many Senators are interested in this.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Many Senators are interested. The Senator from Wisconsin can present his amendment later. If the Senator will bear with me, I think many Senators have a vital interest in this subject, so, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, it is proposed to strike out lines 6 through 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on the pending amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I desire to explain the amendment briefly again. We have reduced the amount requested for the military B-70 airplane—a mach 3 airplane—from the amount requested by the previous administration, from \$358 million to \$220 million. At the same time, we ask for an original subsidy to develop a comparable commercial airplane. Although the figure is only \$12 million, I was told by the agency responsible for the recommendation that the plane would ultimately cost between \$500 million and \$700 million. Therefore, I do not think we should refuse to give the military a mach 3 airplane and at the same time subsidize the development of a commercial mach 3 airplane. That statement summarizes the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I should say that our attention was not called to the fact that by voting for an appropriation of the nature stated we would be voting for a civilian airplane rather than a military airplane. I subscribe fully to what the Senator from Missouri has said and intend to support him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from New Mexico. I did not understand the full significance of the item. Therefore, I went to the FAA to find out what it was about, and protested the item to them, and told them I felt the way I expressed myself on the floor this afternoon.



Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read the budget justification for the amount proposed for the project so the Senate will know exactly what it is asked to pass upon:

The President requested \$12 million for the initial effort in developing a civil supersonic aircraft. The development and production of this airplane is essential to the continued U.S. leadership in commercial aviation.

This was the testimony:

Government financial assistance is required since industry cannot finance the development alone. It is anticipated that the aviation industry will finance a portion of the costs during development stages and, in addition, a substantial recovery of the Government-financed costs can be realized by means of royalties paid by private purchasers of these transports. The initial research and evaluation will take approximately 2 years, at which time we will carefully evaluate the advisability of continuing with this project. It is, therefore, important that a thorough examination of all phases of this program be made in these first 2 years.

That was the substance of the testimony.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to finish this part of the statement first. The House then appropriated \$10 million to start this item.

The Administrator went on to testify:

We requested \$12 million for the first steps in a program to develop a civil supersonic transport aircraft. I firmly believe that this program must be started immediately. This is the minimum step necessary to compete with the rest of the world in development of heavy transport aircraft. The House supported the concept of this program but reduced our request from \$12 to \$10 million. I can assure you that the \$12 million requested had already been substantially reduced below the amount technically competent members of my staff believed should be spent for this program in the first year. I am convinced that we can, through prudent management, begin several airframe and engine studies during 1962 with \$12 million. However, any lesser amount will reduce the effectiveness of the studies we plan to conduct during 1962 and 1963 to determine the feasibility of continuing with this program.

An appropriation will be required during 1963 to complete the first phase of this program and the House instructed us to contain these costs within \$20 million. I do not believe that the necessary data can be developed for this amount. In my judgment we should limit our costs to less than \$50 million for the first 2 years.

Further, a study and analysis up to date has brought forth certain conclusions. The testimony goes on:

The development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft appears certain. The question is whether this aircraft will be developed by the United States, by one of our allies, or by Russia.

There are 10 reasons stated in the testimony, including:

Reduction in the \$12 million request will force either a limitation on the number of companies participating in the competitive efforts of industry or in the amount of work performed. The United States could then be placed in the position of either making a decision with insufficient information or delaying the decision, thus giving undue advantage to our competitors.

The chairman is not familiar with the technical details or the problem as between the development of the B-70 and this program. This is purely a civilian program, testified to by the space agency and the FAA. At the President's request we put it in. Now I understand from those on the Defense Department Appropriation Subcommittee that they have tried to push the B-70 in the defense appropriation bill and that the administration has asked to cut that or not to spend X number of dollars for this program. At the same time they do suggest this program. That is the situation before the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If this is so important to the companies why do we have to pay for a study? If there is a new motor coming up in the automobile industry, or a new chemical in the chemical industry, industries do not come to Washington. It would cost 12 leading companies in the industry, including airlines as well as plane producers, a million dollars apiece to do that. In that way it would not be necessary for the taxpayers to pay for a study which would react so much to their advantage if it worked out, and would cost the taxpayers everything if it did not work out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is not in the testimony, but I understand—and I ask the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to correct the RECORD if this is not the case—if the military aspects of the B-70 program were carried forward, the same companies would be doing it, or at least a combination of them. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, it would be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would have to be the same companies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of necessity it would be some of the same companies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So, whether it was a civilian program or a military program, both would be involved in this work on the B-70's.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the development of the B-70 in the military program were proceeded with, as the committee has already voted money for it, would not the same companies be involved in the program of research and development?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There was competition for the B-70. One company won that competition. Anything developed by that company thereupon could be given by the Government to other companies to be commercially available. One company is developing that airplane. Here we are asked to subsidize all companies in the commercial field, if we carry out the program as suggested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would not the builder of the military B-70 have to deal with a large number of airplane companies that can do the job?

Mr. SYMINGTON. They did that, and they picked one. Therefore they do not have to deal with any more companies, except subcontractors. They could use two companies to build the en-

tire airplane; or they could give the construction of wings to one company as a subcontractor, and so forth. However, the prime contractor has been chosen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That was in 1953?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The program was decided on in 1953. The contract was let several years later.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have always supported the B-70 program. I have supported the program in the hope that out of the military mach 3 plane would come many lessons which would help guide us in the mach 3 civilian plane. I have followed it with great hope. I have been very greatly disappointed to find that the engines of the airplane and almost everything about the B-70 would be ruled out except for it serving as a flying platform; that we will learn from the B-70 the proper metals to use and other factors involving the high heating element of mach 3 passage; but there will be very little we can take, as we have in the past, from the military lesson, and convert this plane into a modern mach 3 civilian plane.

I have supported the B-70 on faith, because I think America must forge ahead in aviation, the same as we must forge ahead in space. However, I cannot bring myself to the position of saying, "Let us wait until we have the mach 3 B-70 flying before we start planning in the blueprint stage; before we start studying aerodynamics; before we learn about the kind of motor we must have and the configuration of the plane necessary to carry the passenger and cargo loads; the type of plane that can operate from civilian airports."

Perhaps mach 3 is not important in civil aviation. I feel it is. I know the problem caused by the creation of the mach 3 civilian plane in England has been of such a magnitude that the British are throwing all of their great aviation companies together in a consortium. They still figure they would not have money enough to take the plane from the planning stage to the production stage.

There have been indications that that may be done in the United States; that all our great aviation companies might join together, so that the free world might have a mach 3 civilian plane.

But to sit by and not do anything until the B-70 will be flying—perhaps not until 1970—before we start putting on paper a study with the slide rule, and begin to do the things that must be learned about the new element of flying, would, I believe, be somewhat foolhardy.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri has said there are 18 great aircraft companies. I do not know, but I understand they are almost broke. The airplane business has come upon sad days because it has not had orders. The work on jets has almost broken some of our finest and oldest companies—Convair with its great 880 and Douglas with its DC-8. I know the condition of those companies. I know of their workload. The result will be the almost tragic decline of a once great industry.



All this proposal does, as I understand, is to put the minds of America on the study of the problems which will be faced for the construction of a mach 3 civilian plane, to help get it underway in, perhaps, 5 years. I would never be in favor of building a plane with a Government subsidy or Government money; but I think, as we spend hundreds of millions, yes, even billions, in space, to determine the kind of space vehicle that can best serve us both militarily and in our scientific effort, then we should be doing something in the field of hemispheric transportation, because I have a hunch that our grandchildren will still be using planes instead of space capsules.

I feel that we must learn and plan. I guarantee the Senator from Missouri that if the study is completed, I will never support a single dime for the production of these aircraft for civilian operation. However, I think that if we expect to be there when the competition is heavy, we had better have our paperwork done. That is the purpose of the proposal.

I was doubtful about this, as was the Senator from Missouri, when I first learned of it; but I have tried to think through the question, Who will help us develop the planning and the study and the information we must have to reach mach 3 in civilian aviation. Wind tunnel tests show that mach 3 is the ideal speed for turbulence, swirls, and other factors with which I am not familiar. It takes less strain to travel at mach 3 than it does at mach 2 or mach 1.

In my opinion, we would be playing very carelessly with the time we might have and with the future of American aviation leadership, which has been pre-eminent in the last year or two.

The chart prepared by the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] emphatically illustrates, I believe, what might happen to American aviation. No longer do our planes constitute 98 percent of the air framework on the world's airports. We have slid down to less than 50 percent. It is time that we look ahead. No firm that I know of will be able to invest \$10 million, and certainly not the full amount of the \$50 million for complete studies. So we must either do this or not do it. I think it is worth a gamble, because the aviation industry sales, particularly of the \$50 million for the whole study, is less than the price of ten 707's. Yet if someone else brings out a mach 3 plane—if Russia, Britain, or France does it—then the market is gone. It will be 10 years before we get it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, I respect his opinion in everything, and especially with respect to commercial aviation. First, he says that the B-70 may fly in 1970. I do not know whether the year it will fly is classified, so I will not give it. But it will be many years before 1970, although based on these monetary cuts some of us have opposed, it will not be a weapons system.

In addition, it has been the history of aviation that our commercial planes are the result of the development of military planes. The B-52 and the KC-135 are as different from the 707 or the 720, almost as night from day. For the first time we would now be reversing the process, and putting commercial development ahead of military development.

The Senator from Oklahoma speaks about the tremendous impact this development will have on the airplane industry. I think we have already shown this afternoon that the total number of planes which would be bought is 200. So there will not be any radical increase in the aviation industry, even if everything about this development turns out satisfactorily.

There are some companies that have not done well in aviation. That is true of any industry I know of, whether it be steel or motors, or any business. I am dead certain one plane company's profits last year were more than half the total amount about which we are talking.

My basic point where the Senator from Georgia brought up the question of subsidy on the floor, was that I did not see how the American people could stop the development and production of a B-70 weapons system—military aircraft—at the same time they were subsidizing the development of a comparable commercial aircraft. That was my point.

The FAA, in my opinion, has many problems to consider, in addition to developing new airplanes for industry and airlines.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator from Missouri knows that the first responsibility for the development of civil aviation rests upon the Administrator of the FAA. The FAA has not attempted in any way that I know of, and neither have those who were interested in civil aviation, to reduce or to cut down the B-70 program. I have supported it consistently, as I have told the Senator. I feel certain the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee on independent offices appropriations, has supported it. So the fact that the amount has been reduced is the result of activity by the Department of Defense, not by the Federal Aviation Agency.

We hope we shall learn something from the program, as we will learn undoubtedly from study and planning, and turn over to our manufacturers, if the planning shows it is possible to produce such civilian aircraft, the job of production, so that the United States will not lag behind.

I shall read from page 625 of the hearings. Mr. Najeeb Halaby, a competent engineer, a test pilot, a man of experience, testified:

The reason that the B-70 is not such an article is that the engine is designed for military missions and they make a very excessive noise for operation out of any commercial airport, first. Secondly, those engines are designed for very high bursts of speed to get away from targets, and the fuel consumption is extremely high from an economic standpoint. The fuel consumption of the engine would have to be developed

from the standpoint of a commercial supersonic transport. And the airplane is designed for military reconnaissance.

Also the crew quarters that I have walked through are very small. The B-70 will teach us something about construction and about stability and control, about temperature effects—the engines of this airplane are so hot that you can see through portions of it when it is in operation. In other words, the opacity due to the heat and light radiation is such that you can actually see, like through an X-ray. The temperature of the engine is in the order of 500° C.—so the nuts and bolts and joints are going to have to be developed.

And we are going to learn a great deal about that when we first fly the B-70 test beds in about 2 years—

This is the test bed; it is not the finished plane.

actually the first flight would be January 1, 1963; we can learn a great deal about the technology of the supersonic, but we will not have anything resembling the supersonic airliner and North American is the first to agree—

This is the company that is making the B-70.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The first to agree—

Mr. MONRONEY. North American is the first company to agree that it will not have anything like an airliner in their production of the B-70.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, let me say that only recently I have had a statement from North American, pointing out that a very great deal of the B-70 would be fully capable of being utilized in the development of a commercial airliner.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate that. Two years ago I talked to North American, when they were very hopeful that there would be an airframe that could be developed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I received my information this week.

Mr. MONRONEY. No doubt the Senator has received information more recent than that I received.

A month ago, some of the North American engineers whom I saw at the space conference at Tulsa told me they felt they could not make this one into a satisfactory plane.

Mr. President, I now complete the reading of the quotation from the hearings:

But this is not to say that we are not dependent upon the B-70—we are, and I hope it will continue.

Personally I believe it is a valuable and flexible adjunct to our deterrent power and as an agency we are counting on learning a great deal and without it it would cost more to develop a supersonic transport than it will with the B-70.

They are compatible. The question is whether we wish to say we have reached the end of all aviation development, now that we are in the jet age. I rather think that if we can afford to spend the amount of money we are spending on space exploration, we had better be interested in plane operation at from 70,000 to 100,000 feet above the earth, because that is where the long-range traffic will be moving in 5 or 10 years, at three times the speed of sound. Perhaps the plane that will be doing that



will be an American plane; I hope it will be, or else we shall lose our air supremacy, because a mach 1 plane cannot compete with a mach 3 plane; and if foreign airlines are then using mach 3 planes, and if our airlines have nothing better than mach 1 planes, our airlines will be unable to compete. For instance, it is impossible to compete—as our airlines have found out—with Constellations, if the competitive lines are using prop-jets.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I think we need to do the necessary homework and make the necessary preparations. If we do not, we shall be delayed for a number of years.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who is one of the most knowledgeable men in the Nation in regard to commercial aircraft. He has stated the case precisely.

A short time ago I discussed this matter, here on the floor of the Senate; and at that time I submitted considerable data and presented charts. I regret that not more Members were present at that time.

The point is that today we have put \$700 million into research on the B-70, and we are going to build it. There is no question about that. The President's budget calls for a prototype bomber. Some of us have appeared before the Appropriations Committee, with the support of my great friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and have advocated an increasing amount of funds for the B-70. There is no question that we are going to build it. The only question is whether we shall utilize the developments from those vast expenditures, in order to obtain a plane which will enable us to be first in the field of commercial aircraft. We are providing \$10 million for the use of the FAA in that field.

Heretofore we have provided planes on the basis of military prototypes. For instance, we did that with the Boeing 707. We converted the B-47, the B-52, and the C-135; and that worked fairly well. But every expert to whom I have talked says that when we get into the mach 3 field, we have new problems. One is with the engines. A military-plane engine which will work on the Boeing 707 and on our piston-driven aircraft will not work at all on a commercial supersonic jet. That is true because the B-70 engine is engineered to take off with full operation of the afterburners, and the noise is terrific. That can be handled satisfactorily on defense missions, flying from military fields far removed from civilian populations. But such engines cannot be put into operation in commercial jets.

We have similar problems in connection with take-off from the airports at subsonic speeds; and we have the problem of acceleration into the supersonic area, where we get the supersonic boom. We cannot have commercial jets running around the country and knocking out vast numbers of windows in people's houses.

In addition, we have to design an engine of reasonable fuel consumption at

both subsonic and supersonic speeds. That is important, because jet planes run out of fuel very quickly.

So the consensus of opinion among the experts is that we must have a new engine, and that the new engine will itself pace the progress of the model which comes out of the B-70.

They have made great progress with the B-70, and it is a good airplane. The research done on it will do a great deal to solve the problems we face. But we have to be able to fly the supersonic mach 3 jets at subsonic speeds, and we have to be able to change the wing slant—which is not true of the military version. The military version can be barreled off the runways and taken up to high altitudes, with the same wing slant at all levels. But that cannot be done with the commercial airplanes.

There are similar problems in regard to the contents of the hull. It is one thing to have a crew on a B-52 or B-58 in a pressurized cabin, wearing pressurized suits, so that if the plane's pressure is lost, there will be secondary features to take care of them.

These are some of the matters which have to be made the subject of very detailed and extensive research.

We know this is true; and we want the Congress to commit this money—\$12 million—in this particular bill. The committee has limited the total to \$20 million. We want the \$12 million appropriated, in order to make it possible to review this situation and see what we can do to parallel the development of the B-70 with the necessary research on hulls, engines, and other scientific information, so as to make it possible to use the knowledge we obtain from the B-70 in the development of a supersonic jet commercial transport. And we must start now. The total for the development of this airplane is roughly estimated to be \$500 million. The development cost of the DC-8 was almost enough to break the Douglas Company. All of us know that.

Then we shall have to face the problem of who will handle the development cost. We are not asking Congress to decide that now. At this time we are asking for \$12 million, so as to make sure that we do not waste, insofar as the commercial jet transport is concerned, the \$700 million, plus all the additional millions of dollars that we shall spend on the B-70. If we are intelligent about this, we can come out on top, at the end, as we have done in the past—in this case, as the country producing the first commercial jet airplane.

I have here chart No. 8, which shows the program we are facing and the time schedules. As compared with it, Senators will see the one for the B-47, the B-52, and the Boeing 707. We have learned some things; and the British have learned some things, too. They went into the Comet without the necessary background; and two or three of those planes blew up. That teaches us that we have to start ahead of time. We did that when we went to work on the B-707; but in that connection we had the benefit of the experience, back

of us, of the work done on the B-47, the B-52, and the C-135.

We utilize that experience. What Mr. Halaby, of the FAA, is saying—and he is right—is that the time to start is now, and not wait 2 or 3 years, and find that Great Britain, or Russia, or some other country, has come into the field with supersonic jet aircraft, while we have had the first operational supersonic bomber in the free world, the B-52, because the B-70 will fly for the first time, in prototype form, in July 1962, if the schedule is met—

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, did the Senator say the B-52 is supersonic?

Mr. ENGLE. No, it is not. I intended to say B-58. I wish to correct the record.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. First let me finish this thought.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am glad to hear what the Senator said.

Mr. ENGLE. It would be ridiculous for us to spend the kind of money we are spending in this research program, and then turn down "peanuts" to try to get a supersonic transport aircraft. I hope the Senate will not do it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator for yielding and for inserting the word "B-58" in the colloquy. There was another rather extensive colloquy held on the floor this afternoon, and other names of other planes were mentioned, but nobody mentioned the B-58, which is the only manned supersonic bomber in the free world today. It flies at twice the speed of sound. Yet the executive departments are recommending that no more be manufactured, when we have only two wings and have smaller planes. The B-58 flies at twice the speed of sound and is the only manned supersonic plane in the free world.

The B-70 is in the planning stage. Years from now we can look forward to its development. But to cut off the B-58 and destroy the assembly lines, in the midst of the threat we face today, would be the height of folly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I want to say a very few words more about the proposed amendment. Since the B-70 program began, 3½ years ago, it has gone through 6 major changes, up and down, forward and backward. The recommendation of the previous administration, as mentioned earlier, was for \$358 million. That amount has now been reduced to \$220 million, although to the best of my knowledge, all the members on the committee believe it should be more instead of less. But for this commercial development, we not only have the \$12 million item we are talking about, but also \$8½ million in NASA, a total of \$20½ million.

The able Senator from Washington pointed out testimony on the House side to the effect that they thought this entire research and development could be done for \$20 million. But the head of the FAA was candid enough to say he did not think it could be done for that.



He thought it would take \$50 million.

We are only starting. This is only the beginning. That is what we are talking about.

Because of my devotion to, and memories of, my experiences in aviation, I would not protest this item if it was not for the fact that I do not see how the Government could refuse to acquiesce, which it is doing, in the development of a weapons system for the B-70, a military mach 3 aircraft, at the same time it subsidizes for industry a comparable commercial mach 3 aircraft. That sums it up.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am going to do something I would ordinarily hesitate to do; namely, having first voted to support the committee and the chairman, to vote on the floor of the Senate against what the committee has recommended.

I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri for this reason. There are two questions involved. One is the death of mach 3 aircraft for commercial and military aviation—military first, and then commercial. The second is the amount of money involved. We are talking about the difference between zero and \$12 million.

The House provided \$10 million for this item. The Senate committee added \$2 million more. Now the motion of the Senator from Missouri is to strike out the whole \$12 million item. If we strike the amount and support the Senator from Missouri, and take the matter to conference and try to adjust the matter between now and the decision in conference, the conference can put \$10 million back in the bill. So all that will be lost to the FAA, if we support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, will be \$2 million.

On the defense side of the question, the previous administration, the Eisenhower administration, requested \$358 million for the development of the B-70. The present administration cut that amount to \$220 million. The House put it back to \$448 million. While the committee of the Senate has not reported yet, I have every reason to believe that the Senate committee is going to report an amount of \$448 million for research and development for the B-70.

I agree fully that there are some commercial purposes that cannot be utilized out of the B-70 engine for military purposes. The Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] stated that very clearly. But we get some information that the Defense Department may not spend all of the \$448 million that will be provided. It is in the discretion of the Department to do that. It is in their judgment. What they can do is spend a few more dollars for better and quicker development of the B-70 engine, and perhaps go into developments that will be helpful for commercial purposes, such as quieting the engine, changing the crew quarters, and other developments of that sort. So I think that, by voting to support the motion of the Senator from Missouri, we will send the matter to conference. The final difference will be a difference of \$2 million, or ultimately

the \$12 million, if the House figure is cut out.

At the same time, if we support what I believe will be the position of the Senate Defense Appropriation Subcommittee, we will put back in the bill confirming the action of the House, \$448 million for the development and research of the B-70, which is almost double what the present administration has asked for. How much more of that amount will be spent is a matter of judgment.

I think that is the sound, sensible thing to do, and I say it most respectfully. I have talked to the chairman of the committee, and he has told me he did not object to saying what I have now said, and to changing my position. I hope we will support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to take only a second or two. I am sure the objective of all of us on the Appropriations Committee, on the Armed Services Committee, and on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, is the same. We want to build as good an airplane as we can get for the future.

That objective was stated in the testimony several times. It was stated that the whole question was a matter of policy for the Congress. I am sure, whatever is done, the matter will come up again and we will have to have a definite policy in this field.

I may say to the technical experts in aviation that what bothers me is that I cannot see how developing the B-70, whether for military or civilian purposes, is not for the benefit of the whole program and why there has to be a separation. Apparently there are reasons why that is so. It seems to me we ought to go ahead on both programs, if we decide to, so we can have a good start in the new air era we are entering.

I probably could have taken the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, but I thought it was a matter on which the Senate should vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.



On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 35, as follows:

[No. —]

[No. 113]

|               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson      | Fulbright    | Proxmire       |
| Bennett       | Gore         | Robertson      |
| Boggs         | Hart         | Russell        |
| Bridges       | Hickenlooper | Saltonstall    |
| Bush          | Hickey       | Smathers       |
| Carlson       | Keating      | Smith, Maine   |
| Case, S. Dak. | Long, Mo.    | Stennis        |
| Church        | McClellan    | Symington      |
| Cotton        | McNamara     | Talmadge       |
| Curtis        | Miller       | Thurmond       |
| Douglas       | Morse        | Williams, Del. |
| Dworshak      | Mundt        |                |

#### NAYS—35

|              |              |            |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Aiken        | Fong         | Mansfield  |
| Bartlett     | Hayden       | Metcalf    |
| Bible        | Hill         | Monroney   |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Holland      | Neuberger  |
| Carroll      | Humphrey     | Prouty     |
| Case, N.J.   | Jackson      | Randolph   |
| Clark        | Javits       | Schoeppel  |
| Dodd         | Jordan       | Scott      |
| Eastland     | Kuchel       | Sparkman   |
| Ellender     | Long, Hawaii | Wiley      |
| Engle        | Long, La.    | Yarborough |
| Ervin        | Magnuson     |            |

#### NOT VOTING—30

|           |           |                |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| Allott    | Goldwater | Morton         |
| Beall     | Gruening  | Moss           |
| Burdick   | Hartke    | Muskie         |
| Butler    | Hruska    | Pastore        |
| Byrd, Va. | Johnston  | Pell           |
| Cannon    | Kefauver  | Smith, Mass.   |
| Capehart  | Kerr      | Tower          |
| Chavez    | Lausche   | Williams, N.J. |
| Cooper    | McCarthy  | Young, N. Dak. |
| Dirksen   | McGee     | Young, Ohio    |

So Mr. SYMINGTON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendments designated "7-28-61—C," and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 4, line 9, strike out "\$38,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$36,000,000".

On page 18, line 16, strike out "\$194,546,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$181,325,000".

Beginning with the word "projects" on page 18, line 22, strike out all through line 12 on page 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "projects approved by the Public Works Committees of Congress in accordance with section 7(a) of such Act."

On page 21, line 19, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000".

On page 26, lines 6 and 7, strike out "\$290,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$250,000".

On page 35, lines 16 and 17, strike out "\$276,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$275,000,000".

On page 38, line 7, strike out "\$47,053,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,053,000".

On page 38, line 8, strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22,000,000".

On page 40, line 23, strike out "\$77,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, while Senators are in the Chamber, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin cover nine items in the bill. All those items refer to different sections of the bill, different activities of the Government, and different agencies. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether his request for a yea-and-nay vote is a request covering all nine items contained in his amendments, or whether he is asking for a yea-and-nay vote on each item in the group? It would be quite confusing to have one yea-and-nay vote on all nine different items.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the chairman of the subcommittee, the principle of the amendments is very simple. They would reduce each appropriation to the budget request. That is all I am asking in my amendments. I have asked for one yea-and-nay vote. Wherever the Committee on Appropriations has recommended a higher appropriation for an item contained in the budget request, my amendment would reduce it to the amount requested by the President in the budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some Senators may wish to vote to reduce particular items to the budget request, and others might wish to retain items as they are contained in the bill. I wish to have it clear, when we have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendments, whether we shall be voting for all items contained in the amendments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the clarification.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered would not deny any Senator the right to demand a division of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators are entitled to demand a division.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair. Therefore, if a Senator wishes to vote on an item separately, he has a right to demand a division of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President—

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask whether I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. At what point in the proceedings may Senators ask for a division of the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At any time before a vote.

Mr. JAVITS. May a Senator do so notwithstanding the fact that he does not have the floor? I wish to ask for a division on two of the items contained in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER.—The Senator must have the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for that purpose so the Senator will know with what he is faced in a procedural sense?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I prefer to defer that question. I have a relatively brief explanation to make.

The President of the United States is overlastingly right to insist on firmness in Berlin. In this he obviously has the enthusiastic support of the Senate.

To substantiate our commitment in Berlin, the President recommended that we increase the size and adaptability of our conventional Armed Forces. Yesterday the Senate passed without dissent an authorization for nearly 1 billion increase in military spending for the fiscal year.

This sharp increase in budget outlays imposes upon us a most serious dual obligation:

First. To make absolutely certain that each dollar spent to augment our military strength is well spent; and

Second. To take a further long, hard look at all spending programs in order to reassess the priority of uses the tax-



payers' dollars in the light of the Berlin crisis.

The seriousness of this obligation is clear when we examine the overall budget totals for the current fiscal year.

The President has stated that the expected deficit will be over \$5 billion. He has expressed his commitment to the principle of a balanced budget, having pledged that the estimates he will present to Congress next January will balance income and expenditure.

Last year's budget deficit turned out to be a whopping \$3.9 billion, it was announced last week—well beyond expectations. So we are presently in the position of planning in advance, of programming by clear statement of intent, a 2-year budget deficit of \$9 billion.

This deficit comes at a time when personal income is running at an all time record rate of \$416.7 billion per year, and steadily going up. At the very least this contrast of statistics should cause us to pause and reflect again on the spending activities to which we have been and are presently committing the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer.

Our concern of course, has to be focused where the spending is on the sharp rise in defense expenditure. Unless we couple our support for the President's requests with sharp-eyed scrutiny of every aspect of the military budget, this could turn out to be a season of great waste.

No one can deny that the military spending spurt provides a tempting opportunity for the lobbyist who wants his pet project, or obsolete weapon, back in operation and production.

A number of reforms should be adopted to give us a leaner, tougher defense—at a lower cost to boot. Among them are the following:

First. The share of budget-padding cost-plus contracts should be drastically reduced. Congress wisely requires that our enormous defense outlays should be subject wherever possible to the financial discipline of competitive bidding. Yet year after year both the total dollar amount and the percent of contracts let through noncompetitive cost-plus contracts goes up.

In 1951 only 13 percent of military contracts were cost plus, compared to 42 percent today. Another 45 percent are now fixed cost, and only a pathetic 13 percent by competitive advertised bidding. This is a subject which I discussed yesterday on the floor with the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator RUSSELL. I was glad to hear that he would be "very much surprised" if a substantial number of cost-plus contracts were awarded to procure the items contained in yesterday's authorization.

He said that there are "very few" items in the bill which would have to be procured by cost-plus contracts, and expressed the prediction that there will be a substantial decrease in the percent of cost-plus awards under the present administration.

This is a prediction which I most profoundly hope comes true.

Second. Yesterday the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] placed in the RECORD the text of a letter from Labor Secretary Goldberg describing the work of the Missile Sites Labor Commission. The letter stated:

During 1960 a total of 86,000 man-days of work were lost because of strikes on missile and space sites. This averages out to over 7,000 man-days lost per month in 1960.

The letter goes on to describe the great improvement that has already been achieved in this situation. This is most heartening, and I hope it continues.

Our space program demands enormous outlays, and the kind of cynical abuse of the public interest indicated by these wanton work stoppages sours the fine achievements of our scientists and astronauts.

Third. Recently the Senator from Mississippi [Senator STENNIS], called attention to the serious implications of the fact that out of nearly 900,000 soldiers in our Army, we get only 14 divisions. The Soviet Union, which also has a modern army, has a much higher ratio of combat troops to support personnel.

Millions of us who served in the Armed Forces in World War II, or in the Korean war, know from firsthand experience about the serious waste of manpower. Endless months are consumed in training, frequently repetitive. Often there are three men to do the job of one.

Fourth. More vigorous action to shut down obsolete and unneeded facilities, and to halt further procurement of unneeded items. Vested interests cluster around any military project and try to keep it going—at public expense—as long as possible, even when there is no justification. Military leaders have an obligation ruthlessly to prune these totally unneeded drains on the Treasury.

Fifth. Tighten military accounting methods. Right now there is so much slack that Pentagon brass think nothing of diverting enormous sums from one purpose to another, with no regard for the clearly stated directives contained in the budget. The Comptroller General recently disclosed the fact that this kind of side-door financing hoodwinked the taxpayer into paying for \$50 million worth of construction not specified in the budget.

If these and other needed reforms are adopted the useful strength of our forces can be greatly increased at minimum cost.

Careful ferreting out of military waste is essential. It can save literally millions of dollars.

However, the magnitude of the spending increase for defense purposes which has been requested by the President, and which the Senate yesterday unanimously authorized, will impose a heavy drain on the Treasury even if all these essential reforms are adopted.

I think it is incumbent, on us, therefore, to take another look at the broad range of nonmilitary spending programs for which we have been and are providing funds.

The President has spoken of sacrifice. If this word is to be more than rhetoric,

I think we must scrutinize the many undertakings of the Federal Government which, no matter how worthwhile they may be, all contribute to the the large budget deficit that is contemplated.

The situation in Berlin is serious. The President has expressed the determination of our Nation to hold firm against the Khrushchev threat against the integrity of that city.

As an earnest of that determination he has asked for \$3.45 billion above an already increased defense budget, to procure weapons and to increase the size of our Armed Forces.

These things are essential.

There are many activities of the Federal Government costing a great deal of money which, while extremely worthwhile, are not essential.

They are simply desirable.

I suggest that if "sacrifice" is to have meaning, if our determination to strengthen ourselves to meet cold-war emergencies is genuine, then we must be prepared to choose between what is essential and what is desirable.

In furtherance of this principle I have offered an amendment which, as I have already explained, reduces each item in the appropriation bill which is now pending before the Senate to the budget request, item by item. The agencies which are affected are the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization, Emergency Supplies and Equipment, which is cut from \$38½ million to \$36 million, a reduction of \$2½ million. "GSA Construction of public buildings" is cut from more than \$194 million to about \$181 million, a saving in excess of \$13 million. Supplies and expenditures for public building projects, is cut from \$25 million down to \$5 million, a saving of \$20 million. "GSA administrative salaries and expenses" are cut from \$290,000 to \$250,000, a saving of \$40,000. The National Science Foundation is reduced from \$276½ million to \$275 million. A reduction of \$1½ million. "VA medical research" is cut from \$47 million to \$37 million, a saving of \$10 million. "Construction of VA hospital facilities" is reduced from \$77½ million to \$75 million, a saving of \$2½ million.

In every one of these cases, without exception, the administration had ample opportunity to come and ask for the funds they wanted and thought they could use and thought were essential. In every one of these instances the Appropriations Committee has asked to spend more than the administration's request by the amounts I have indicated.

Of course, it is up to Congress to decide how much to appropriate. We take great pride, and proper pride, in asserting that we decide how much money to appropriate. I believe we exercise discretion in reducing administration requests, which the Appropriations Committee has wisely done in the case of many of the items in the bill—in many more cases, indeed, than those in which increases have been granted.

Nevertheless, it seems to me, on balance, that if, as I say, sacrifices are going to mean anything, if we are going



to cut any essential expenditures anywhere, that we should cut appropriations back to the level requested by the administration.

One more word, and I am through with my presentation of the bill. This is not a parsimonious administration. I believe many recognize that it is an administration which has been concerned about waste but almost no one would call it pennypinching. Certainly it has not been excessively cautious with public money. No one has said that. Therefore, it would seem to me to make sense that we live up to what the President has asked Congress to do, not to exceed his requests.

Many Senators have been Governors, and recognize the great advantage of an item veto. The President does not have that advantage. Many of us feel that he should have it. This amendment in effect gives the President an item veto, because it is an amendment which would reduce each one of the requests back to what the President asked the Congress to appropriate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin upon offering this amendment. I shall support it. I would like to ask him two questions. I assume that when he speaks of the President's budget requests, he means the revised requests of the budget, as reduced by the administration since the first of the year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In many cases, of course, there was no reduction, but wherever there was a reduction, it is a cutback to the original request. This is the Kennedy budget.

Mr. BUSH. We are considering figures as revised by the Kennedy administration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. The other question that I should like to ask the Senator is whether he would not consider, in the absence of any comment from the White House, that the White House would naturally favor his amendment, because what he is doing is asking the Senate to do exactly what the White House wanted to be done.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. It seems to me that it is overwhelmingly logical that they should. This is what they have asked for. The amendment gives them exactly what they have asked, and complies with the plea the President specifically made to Congress: "Please do not go above our budget requests."

Mr. BUSH. So, in the absence of any other word from the White House, we can assume that we are doing this with his blessings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator's logic is irresistible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It has been my intention to ask for a separate vote on a particular part of the amendment, which begins on line 5, page 1, relating

to projects. These are projects approved by the Public Works Committees of Congress in accordance with section 7(a) of such act.

The reason is that I understand that these words are redundant, in this respect, that all of these projects which are listed in the bill have been approved. The language the Senator is using is a carryover from last year, when there was doubt whether they had been approved. All this will do is remand them for reconsideration to the Public Works Committee on every project which is listed in the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York has an excellent point. I thought that point would come up. I believe the Senate could work its will and it could decide to let the Public Works Committee make its decision. On the other hand the Senate could provide that the administration shall have discretion to construct buildings that are listed in the bill, and we could perhaps limit the administration to a selection from the list. I have prepared an amendment to accomplish that purpose. I am ready to offer it. If the Senator has an amendment of his own, I would be delighted if he were to offer it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that under the rule all the amendments be voted on separately. It would be confusing if we voted on them together.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does that require another unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move—

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that that requires unanimous consent. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment. Therefore, the amendment cannot be modified without unanimous consent, and that the vote would have to come on the amendment as it is presently printed, although of course another amendment could be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not a modification. It is a request for a division in the vote. Under rule XVIII there will be nine separate yeas-and-nays votes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Presiding Officer. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before we vote on the amendment, I should like to ask the distinguished manager of the bill on the floor, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], whether some explanation should not be forthcoming on what seemed to me to be the very cogent reasons why in the first instance the committee undertook to increase the amount of the appropriations requested by the President. I have made a cursory, not detailed, study of these matters, and in my opinion in each instance the committee was amply justified in going

over the budget amount. I would not want the Senate to vote without an opportunity given to the committee to justify its position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I intended to do that as soon as the Senator from Wisconsin had yielded the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I thought we were about to vote.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the Chair has ruled there will be a separate yeas-and-nays vote on each item. Therefore, the first yeas-and-nays vote would be on reducing the appropriation for the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization from \$38.5 million to \$36 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I intended to take each item in order. It became confusing when the amendments were considered together, dollarwise. There were different reasons for including the items separately in the bill. I shall discuss the items one by one.

On page 4, line 9, where the Senator from Wisconsin seeks to strike out \$38.5 million and insert in lieu thereof \$36 million, the item includes \$2,500,000 for the Office of Civilian Defense Mobilization for a program of placing throughout the United States X thousand radio-logical detector machines. They are small, compact kits, which would be placed in strategic places, to enable the agency to learn about radioactive fallout and radioactive waste.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. If there are to be nine separate votes, would it not be better to explain each item just before the vote?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does not the Senator ask the junior Senator from Wisconsin to void the order for a yeas-and-nays vote and get down to votes on items which require votes? Nine yeas-and-nays votes will keep up here until 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not ask for a roll-call vote.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Senator asked for the procedure of a yeas-and-nays vote on every item. Why not start over again?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my request for a yeas-and-nays vote; then I shall proceed to explain why the nine items are in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that there be one yeas-and-nays vote on the nine amendments submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand, no such motion will lie, because any Senator is entitled to have a separate vote on each of these items. I do not care about having nine yeas-and-nays votes, but I



do want a separate vote on one of these items, an item which I believe will completely confuse the bill. That is the item on page 1, lines 5 to 9, inclusive. The Senator from Wisconsin himself has admitted that this item will confuse the bill. I do not see how we can operate in this way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion does not lie.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin; and on my motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have not had a ruling on my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion does not lie.

The yeas and nays have been requested on the motion to lay on the table the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to lay the Proxmire amendments on the table. The motion is not debatable. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 114]

YEAS—46

|              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Alken        | Fulbright    | Monroney     |
| Anderson     | Gore         | Morse        |
| Bartlett     | Hayden       | Neuberger    |
| Bible        | Hill         | Prouty       |
| Bridges      | Holland      | Randolph     |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Humphrey     | Russell      |
| Carroll      | Jackson      | Saltonstall  |
| Case, N.J.   | Javits       | Schoeppel    |
| Clark        | Jordan       | Smathers     |
| Cotton       | Kefauver     | Smith, Maine |
| Dodd         | Kuchel       | Sparkman     |
| Eastland     | Long, Mo.    | Stennis      |
| Ellender     | Long, Hawaii | Symington    |
| Engle        | Magnuson     | Yarborough   |
| Ervin        | Mansfield    |              |
| Fong         | Metcalf      |              |

NAYS—25

|               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Bennett       | Hart         | Proxmire       |
| Boggs         | Hickenlooper | Robertson      |
| Bush          | Hickey       | Scott          |
| Carlson       | Keating      | Talmadge       |
| Case, S. Dak. | Long, La.    | Thurmond       |
| Church        | McClellan    | Wiley          |
| Curtis        | McNamara     | Williams, Del. |
| Douglas       | Miller       |                |
| Dworshak      | Mundt        |                |

NOT VOTING—29

|           |           |                |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| Allott    | Goldwater | Moss           |
| Beall     | Gruening  | Muskie         |
| Burdick   | Hartke    | Pastore        |
| Butler    | Hruska    | Pell           |
| Byrd, Va. | Johnston  | Smith, Mass.   |
| Cannon    | Kerr      | Tower          |
| Capehart  | Lausche   | Williams, N.J. |
| Chavez    | McCarthy  | Young, N. Dak. |
| Cooper    | McGee     | Young, Ohio    |
| Dirksen   | Morton    |                |

So the motion to lay Mr. PROXMIRE's amendments on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not like to vote for motions to lay on the table; and I seldom do vote for them, unless there has been ample debate. But in this case the situation is different, for now the Senator from Wisconsin can present each of his amendments separately, in dealing with the separate parts of the bill. In that way we shall have somewhat better order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Washington has made that statement, because I was about to propound a parliamentary inquiry in connection with the situation. But I believe the Senator's explanation has made the situation clear.

I wish the RECORD to show that I voted in favor of the motion to lay the amendment on the table, because I thought the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin should be considered separately by the Senate. I may vote in favor of some of them, or I may vote in favor of all of them; but I want them



to be handled separately. That is why I voted in favor of the motion to lay the amendments on the table.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether the bill as it is now on our desks contains appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the activities of vocational rehabilitation and education?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It does.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Washington may recall that 2 years ago an effort was made by the Veterans' Administration to remove those activities from most of the States, and to concentrate them in a very few locations—in many cases, hundreds of miles distant from the persons who would be using them. At that time the able Senator from Washington advised the Senate that it was intended and expected that these vocational rehabilitation and education activities should remain in the States where they were located.

Is that still the intention of the Committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is still the intention of the committee; and I think the committee is more vigorous than ever in its support of retaining these facilities and activities where they are, because the field of vocational rehabilitation is becoming more and more important, and it is much harder to develop them if they are moved several hundred miles away.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Washington for that explanation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I repeat that if it had not been for the hard work done by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] 2 years ago, and also 3 years ago, in insisting upon an equitable distribution, so that the veterans who need this help can get it, these places might have been shuffled around a very great deal. But we agreed with his premise.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly the Senator from Washington handled the problem very efficiently and satisfactorily at that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee about the situation as it affects manganese and chrome in Montana. The chairman may recall that my colleague [Mr. METCALF] and I appeared before the committee, and the committee inserted certain language which we thought would be beneficial for the upgrading of stockpiled manganese and chrome. We should like to know what became of that language after it was approved by the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator from Montana and to other Senators who are vitally interested in this subject, including the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and other Senators who have followed the subject very closely, that the chairman of the subcommittee, who has only one vote in the subcommittee, and only one in the

full committee, has always believed, along with a few other Members, that the manganese and chrome stockpiles in a raw state, situated in various parts of the country, should be upgraded.

We thought they could be stored better without deterioration, and that the cost of the upgrading would be justified if they could be stored without deterioration, so that if they should be released at any time, they would be worth that much more because of the upgrading process.

The Office of Defense Mobilization consistently contended that the deterioration has not been great. There has been testimony to the contrary. I think, if it is upgraded and can be stored and the value of the product is better, the cost of the upgrading will be compensated for.

The House committee put language in the bill reading:

That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be available without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The Senate committee, after a great deal of discussion and hearing a great deal of testimony, struck that language out. It recommended the restoration of \$10 million to the House allowance, to provide the budget estimate of \$40 million for strategic and critical materials. The House allowed \$30 million, and the Senate restored the budget estimate of \$40 million. Of the restoration, the committee provided that \$8,683,000 is to provide the amount of \$16,667,000 for the rotation of the cordage fibers abaca and sisal, which the committee is advised cannot be delayed without impairing the quality of the stockpile.

For upgrading materials, the committee recommended the balance of the restoration, amounting to \$1,317,000.

So far as I know now, this amount can be used for the upgrading of materials.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I was delighted to have this language in the report, which reads:

The committee believes that savings could be effected through the upgrading of chrome and manganese into a more usable form than to allow the concentrates to waste away by wind and rain action.

As I understand the situation now, the manganese and chrome in the Defense Production Act inventory and in the national stockpile can be upgraded under the Defense Production Act, under the general law, and the money that is appropriated here for any of the other refining processes can be used for that purpose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is my understanding. The language for the exchange of material was stricken out of the House bill, but that takes us to conference.

Mr. METCALF. I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the conference we expect the Senate to follow up the recommendation of the Senate committee when we suggested that the \$1,317,000 be used for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator knows that my colleague [Mr. METCALF] and I considered offering an amendment on the floor during the discussion of the bill, but in view of the situation, and the promise made by the distinguished chairman of the committee that they would do all they possibly could, both in conference and in hearings which might later be held, at his request we are not offering the amendment, in the hope that something can be done to alleviate the condition of producers of manganese and chrome, as well as those who have stockpiles, because, as the Senator knows, those two minerals are important to the economy of the State of Montana.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand from Mr. Cooper, the clerk, because this was technical language, the situation now is that we put back in the bill the budget amount, which adds \$10 million to the House figure, making the total amount \$40 million. We say that \$8,683,000 will be used for the rotation of the cordage fibers, and so forth, leaving \$1,317,000, which we suggest could be well used for the particular purpose of upgrading. But in order to have the language correct and send the question to conference, we struck out the House language on the exchange, so our language can be considered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator means so the language proposed by my colleague [Mr. METCALF] and myself could be considered in conference?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As it relates to this amount.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The bill refers to strategic and critical materials, which is reference to title 50, United States Code, sections 98-98(h). This money would be used for upgrading or beneficiating this material under section 90 of the act, under the order of OCDM, in order to provide a target for the Defense Production Act inventory or national stockpile, whether or not it was upgraded to have higher quality, if it was material determined to be necessary for the national defense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed the amendment which my colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I had intended to offer to this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will take the language of this amendment.

Mr. METCALF. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will take this language to conference. By striking out



the House language, we can consider this language.

There being no objection, the amendment which was intended to have been offered by Mr. METCALF was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following amendment to be inserted following the comma on line 16, page 24, of H.R. 7445, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee: "for the upgrading and/or refining of low grade manganese ores and chrome concentrates held in the Defense Production Act inventory,".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may I ask if the Senator was merely inserting the amendment in the RECORD? He was not offering it as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. The proposed amendment is merely being inserted in the RECORD for the purpose of the record.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee has suggested that I might offer these amendments separately. I defer that decision until Monday. The hour is late. It is questionable whether there will be any further rollcalls tonight. At this time I call up my amendments identified as "7-28-61-D," and I ask for the yeas and nays on them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 23, line 24, to strike out "\$2,175,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,475,000".

Beginning with line 1, page 24, to strike out all to and including line 6, page 24.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that a Senator who is vitally interested in this amendment is not in the Chamber today because of a death in his family. Other Senators are also interested. I would like to ask the proposer of the amendment and the chairman of the committee if there is any possibility of arriving at a time limitation on this particular amendment and voting on it on Monday. If there is no disapproval of such action, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request that an hour be allotted for the consideration of this amendment, beginning at the conclusion of the morning hour Monday, 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. May we have 1 hour to a side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two hours would be satisfactory. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I quite agree with the majority leader that we should not vote tonight. The amendment is of vital concern to several of our colleagues, including the one who cannot

be here tonight because of an unfortunate death in his family. It is an amendment which I think will arouse a considerable amount of discussion. I think it is a very important amendment. It involves, in my judgment, not only the General Services Administration, but also other administrative agencies. I do not think we would use all the time, but I think we ought to err in the direction of including a generous amount of time under the unanimous-consent agreement, and then we can reduce our debate on Monday. I suggest there be one and a half hours on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am willing to make it 3 hours instead of 2 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have some clarification as to whether we are planning to discontinue work now after those of us who have remained on the job—making exception, of course, for our colleague who has been called home because of a death in his family—have spent the better part of the day here. Are we to continue to work? Why not stay until midnight? If it is essential to have sessions on Saturday, let us work. Personally, I do not think it is necessary to have sessions on Saturday. We have been skipping day after day for many weeks. Those of us who come from far distant States have been required to remain here, though the Senate has been dragging its feet and not accelerating the legislative process.

I am not critical of my good friend the majority leader, but I think the time has come when some of us ought to be told in forthright language what we may expect in regard to Saturday sessions and the program during the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may comment on that, I think this is the first—and certainly no more than the second—Saturday session we have had this year. It was hoped that we could complete consideration of the two appropriation bills today, and proceed to the consideration of the foreign aid bill, but it looks as though we shall be delayed for several days.

The Senator from Idaho, who is my good friend of many years, has asked for a frank statement. It appears to me that because of the delay in the session today—it is a justifiable delay, because every Senator has a right to speak on any subject he wishes at any time and for so long as he desires—what we are doing is pushing back the time of adjournment from about Labor Day to about mid-September.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to stay on or to quit.

I thought we would be doing something for an absent Senator who is vitally interested in this particular

amendment, when I made the suggestion I made.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the majority leader has misinterpreted my remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not intentionally.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not object to Saturday sessions. I think perhaps we ought to remain in session until midnight tonight. I suggested that we dispose of this important appropriation bill, with the exception of the one amendment, which could go over until Monday, until the Senator who has been called home because of a death in his family can be back in the Senate for consideration of that very vital amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I say to my friend from Idaho that the majority leader, in all good faith, called the Senate into session at 11 o'clock this morning. We thought we could finish consideration of the bill before us, and perhaps start on the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. What time did we get started on this bill?

Mr. DWORSHAK. At 2:30.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At 2:30.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We were here 3½ hours and we could not even get the bill before the Senate. It is not the majority leader's fault that we have not passed the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, that is why I rose, actually in defense of the majority leader. We did not get into action on this important bill until 2:30 this afternoon, although we were called into session at 11 o'clock this morning. If the plan of the majority leader originally was defensible, we ought to dispose of the bill. Let us go forward and act on all the amendments with the exception of this one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If there were no other amendments to be offered, I should be glad to agree to the Senator's suggestion, but I am becoming a little tired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit.

Mr. BRIDGES. Reserving the right to object, why could we not do as the majority leader has suggested, in regard to having the amendment go over to Monday, and then ask unanimous consent that there be not to exceed, let us say, 20 minutes for each of the other amendments to the bill, to be divided 10 minutes to each side. Certainly any Senator who is intelligent can understand the argument on either side in 10 minutes. We could finish consideration of the bill in the next hour or two, so long as we are here on a Saturday, so that there would be only one thing left to do with regard to the bill on Monday.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer. I think it can be disposed of without too much



time and without too much difficulty, and without a yea-and-nay vote.

I hope that I may have an opportunity to offer the amendment this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have made a unanimous-consent request. Is it agreeable to the Senate to accede to the request I made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANSFIELD. The request is for 3 hours.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. To what did the distinguished Senator from Florida object? Did the Senator object to the request of the majority leader, or to the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understood the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire to request a very limited time limitation with respect to all amendments which might be offered to the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Except for this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have seen some of the other amendments, which I should wish to discuss at some length. I think other Senators will wish to discuss them.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire thinks the Senator from Florida is a very intelligent man who is quick-witted and quick-thinking, and who can absorb all there is to be said, under a 20-minute time limitation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the gracious comments of my friend from New Hampshire, but I do not think he has read all of the amendments I have seen, or he would not make that suggestion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make an inquiry of the majority leader, with respect to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. Do I correctly understand that consideration of the amendment would go over until Monday, and that there would be a time limitation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would go over until Monday. There would be 3 hours on that particular amendment, to begin at the conclusion of morning business.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Can the distinguished majority leader indicate whether there would be any time allowed to Senators who might desire to offer an amendment by way of a substitute for that amendment? I intend to offer such an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time for that would be included within the 3 hours. The time would apply to the pending amendment and to all amendments thereto, under the regular procedure.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. It would be understood, then, that an amendment in the nature of a substitute could be considered within the 3-hour time limitation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I would not be precluded from offering that type of amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what time does the majority leader have in mind for the Senate to meet on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, what time allocation would there be in the case of an amendment offered as a substitute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. What we would try to do would be to divide the time equally between those who are for and those against either the amendment or the substitute for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not think I shall object—does the request relate only to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin now pending?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as later reduced to writing is as follows:

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

*Ordered*, That, effective on Monday, July 31, 1961, at the conclusion of routine morning business the Senate proceed to the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7445, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962, and that debate on the pending amendment proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE (printed as 7-28-61—D) and all amendments thereto, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. PROXMIRE and the mover of any amendment thereto and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment, or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we can talk with respect to the amendment tonight

after any yea-and-nay votes have been concluded. If Senators wish to stay and make insertions in the RECORD or speak on the amendment, they can do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate I announce that there will be no further yea-and-nay votes tonight. Senators may talk on the amendment all they wish. Other amendments, if they are to be agreed to, will have to be agreed to by voice vote. That is the situation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if it is his intention, by continuing the session this evening, to have any of his amendments agreed to by voice vote.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Absolutely not. It is my understanding that an amendment is pending. It would be out of order to take up any other amendment without unanimous consent to do so. I shall speak for only approximately 10 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to state for the RECORD that I shall not call up my amendments tonight. Obviously the Senate is not in a mood to consider them in view of what has been said. I shall call them up on Monday.

#### GSA'S RIGHT TO INTERVENE IN UTILITY RATE CASES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my amendment would continue the authority of the General Services Administration to intervene in transportation and utility regulatory proceedings on behalf of the Federal Government as a major consumer of such services, without having its hands tied by an across-the-board prohibition on the kind and type of arguments and evidence which may be presented.

The bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee contains an amendment restricting use of funds, as follows:

No part of the funds appropriated by the act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies.

The committee also cut funds for this purpose by \$300,000, which is about a 77 percent reduction. At the hearings before the subcommittee, GSA estimated expenditures for this purpose, including legal and agency overhead costs, in the



following amounts for prior fiscal years—hearings, page 1298:

|           |            |
|-----------|------------|
| 1961..... | \$390, 200 |
| 1960..... | 368, 700   |
| 1959..... | 357, 700   |
| 1958..... | 338, 500   |

The language of the limitation would clearly restrict GSA from seeking changes in policies of the regulatory agency. It would eliminate GSA from most of the important State utility cases, because the key issue in those cases most frequently is rate of return from increased rates. These increased rates apply to all consumer—including the U.S. Government as a consumer.

The cut in funds would further tie GSA's hands, by withholding the money needed to finance effective intervention in such cases.

The committee report states the objection of the committee to "participation in—rate—proceedings for the presentation of evidence and argument covering broad matters of regulatory policy such as valuation, rate of return, and other subjects related to overall regulatory policy of the various commissions," page 17.

It so states after first conceding "GSA's obligation to participate in major transportation and utility regulatory proceedings is not disputed, page 17.

In other words, it would be all right for GSA to appear in rate proceedings—but not to present arguments and evidence on the key issues in any rate increase: valuation and rate of return. And the reduction in funds would make even so hog-tied and hamstrung an appearance a pretty feeble one in terms of the number of individuals and the amount of time which could be expended by GSA staff on such a case.

No lawyer asked to represent a client in a rate proceeding would agree to so tie his hands by not permitting himself to discuss the key issues in dispute.

Yet that is precisely what the language of this bill, as reported out of committee, would do.

It is like saying, "You may go swimming—but do not go near the water."

The importance of this matter is clear. Not infrequently GSA has been the only spokesman for a "consumer" interest appearing in a regulatory or rate case. It is no surprise that this has been a source of irritation to those who would like to eliminate the consumer—any consumer—entirely from consideration in such proceedings.

By appearing in regulatory cases on behalf of the Government, GSA has saved the taxpayer millions of dollars, especially in cases involving the rate of return issue. For example, in 1956 Congress directed in 70 Stat. 1012, title 50 United States Code, section 491, that the Air Force be represented in SAGE cases under the GSA statute. In one of those cases, involving private leased communications lines—hearings, page 1139—GSA filed a petition for interim reduction of rates, and in 1958 the FCC ordered a reduction on the basis of excessive rate of return on investment—hearings page 1141. That reduction is saving the Government and the Air

Force about \$100 million in 10 years—hearings, page 1119.

On July 6, 1961, the FCC issued a tentative decision in the same case, to which exceptions may be filed on or before September 15, 1961. The tentative decision contains a proposal that "the proper level of private line earnings approximate 9 percent for Western Union and 7¼ percent for A.T. & T." This rate of return issue is important in the case, but if Congress enacts this limitation there is serious doubt whether GSA can say anything about the subject in its brief on exceptions.

The Government's monetary interest in utility charges amounts to about \$817 million per year, plus \$386 million for communications—hearings, page 1295—plus \$2,106 million for transportation—fiscal 1961 budget data. Under the present system of the Government paying regulated tariff rates, if the Government did not appear in these cases, it would be doing nothing to protect itself against the amount of charges for utilities and communications services which are increased in the general revenue cases—hearings, page 1308.

The committee states in its report that GSA duplicates the activities of the regulatory agencies because its evidence and arguments on rate of return involve the same question which the regulatory agencies must decide. Whether or not this amounts to duplication, however, should give way to the basic theory of American regulatory practice—that decisions in rate cases should be based upon evidence of record, which is produced by witnesses for the regulated company, by witnesses for consumers, and, in some, but not all, cases by witnesses for public counsel of the regulatory agency.

All through the history of regulation public bodies have intervened and presented evidence in these cases. The Federal Government did so in its own consumer interest prior to creation of GSA in 1949—hearings, page 1248—and its statute specifically has authorized continuance of this function. In producing evidence in these cases, GSA merely adds facts to the record which the regulatory agency may consider in its decision. It appears as an advocate for the Government as a large, and often the largest, consumer in the same way that other large consumers, public and private, are represented, while commission staff or public counsel are charged with representing the general public interest, including that of the regulated industry or company.

The GSA statute authorizing this intervention in regulatory proceedings is section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, title 40, United States Code, section 481, which provides that the Administrator of General Services shall, "with respect to transportation and other public utility services for the use of executive agencies, represent such agencies in proceedings involving carriers or other public utilities before State and Federal regulatory agencies."

The amendment to the appropriation proposed by the committee is, in fact, a

limitation in the exercise of this specific statutory authorization.

An attempt was made in 1958 to get GSA out of the transportation and public utility regulation business. It failed. Through the alertness of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] a point of order was made and sustained against an attempt to eliminate GSA's authority.

This time it is my understanding that a point of order against the proviso would not be valid.

Last night I made a point of order, which was not sustained by the Chair. After consultation with the Parliamentarian yesterday, it appears that the amendment is the only way in which the Government's right to appear and present full evidence and argue on principle can be protected.

I have therefore offered an amendment to eliminate it, and to restore the \$300,000 cut by the committee.

I would like to point out that the committee amendment to this bill which my amendment would delete, is stated in terms of "funds appropriated by this act." The Presiding Officer yesterday evening, an advice of the Parliamentarian, sustained my interpretation that this language is so broad that it applies not just to the transportation and public utilities service of the GSA, but to every and any agency appropriated for in this bill.

While this may not have been the intention of the committee, I think it indicates how broad and sweeping a restriction of authority they have inserted into an appropriations bill.

I earnestly hope that the amendment will be adopted.

I yield the floor.

#### THE FUGITIVE FELON ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have objected today to the consideration of the amendment of the Fugitive Felon Act by the Senate because it raises a number of important questions. Unfortunately, I am not an attorney, and therefore am not so knowledgeable about some of these problems of S. 1654 as some of my colleagues are. Nonetheless, as I read the bill, it would have some interesting effects.

The proposed amendment makes it a Federal crime for a person to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to avoid prosecution for a crime or an attempt to commit a crime punishable by a term of more than 1 year under the laws of the State from which the fugitive flees. This measure has been submitted by the Attorney General as part of his program against organized crime.

I was curious to discover what effects this law might have on the State of Oregon, for I know that my State, like the rest of the States, has on its books a number of interesting and archaic provisions, the attempted violation of which would now make one a Federal criminal.

For example, one becomes a Federal criminal for the commission or the at-



tempted commission of any of the following crimes in Oregon:

First. Defaming an insurance company, a bank, or a savings and loan association.

Second. Managing a steamboat or other craft in a manner that might endanger life. I suppose that this would apply to the captain of a boat pulling a vigorous water-skier.

Third. Breaking into the Oregon State Penitentiary.

Fourth. Skinning a carcass worth more than \$75.

Fifth. Stealing harvested and threshed grain, and there is no statement of what amount.

Sixth. Possessing adulterated gold dust.

Seventh. Challenging another person to a duel. I might add that one also would violate the law if he used contemptuous language about any person who refuses to duel.

Eighth. Exposing of any person for public amusement in a state of trance or hypnotism.

Ninth. Finally, we have an antistinkbomb law which makes it a crime to place a stinkbomb in any place where a gathering is being held. This law would make an attempt to place a stinkbomb a Federal crime.

Some other States have some provisions of similar import. For example, Alabama has a statute making it a crime, punishable by not less than 2 years in jail for carrying a rifle walking cane. And, you can spend up to 10 years in jail for the mere possession of unlawful flags or emblems. Alabama, I might add, also has an antistinkbomb law with a 1-year minimum sentence.

In Georgia, you can go to jail for up to 4 years for stealing just one chicken. Or one hog. The theft of a bale of cotton can get you up to 5 years in a Georgia jail.

In Louisiana, the penalty is up to 5 years for abetting in bigamy, and the same penalty for miscegenation.

If you marry someone outside Mississippi who you may not marry in Mississippi because of that person's race, you can spend up to 10 years in a Mississippi jail.

The theft of two horses in North Carolina can put you in jail for 20 years and you can go to jail for 5 years for betting on prizefights.

In New York State, challenging a person to a duel is a crime with a 7-year penalty, and being intoxicated in a public place can put you in jail for up to 3 years. Joyriding is second degree larceny in New York with a maximum penalty of up to 5 years and locking your college roommate in a stable is kidnapping which carries a death penalty. Finally, in New York State, any person staging a masquerade or a masked ball without prior permission can be jailed for up to 2 years and in a law that seems clearly unconstitutional, if a New York resident manages or stages a masquerade or masked ball in any of the other 49 States, he could be imprisoned for up to 2 years.

Further research might bring to light other archaic laws of other States, the

violation of which would now make one a Federal criminal. Surely, it is not the intent of the Senate to enact such broad and sweeping legislation.

I have discussed the argument against this bill on the grounds of absurdity. Now, Mr. President, I would like to make another point. On the books of some Southern States, there are laws aimed specifically against the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. They are so stated they can apply only to this organization. Some of these laws make it a crime to bring more than a certain number of actions against the State. Some make it a crime to fail to disclose information as to contributors or members of certain organizations, particularly organizations having out-of-State memberships, or headquarters. One marvels at the ability of lawmakers to invent ingenious methods to impede the progress of the NAACP.

However, merely because some jurisdictions uses its State laws to harass the NAACP and other advocates of civil rights, I see no reason why it should become a Federal crime punishable by 5 years in jail or a \$5,000 fine, or both, to cross a State line to avoid prosecution for an attempt to commit a crime defined by a State law that may be questioned because of its constitutionality.

If the Attorney General needs the authority he claims, I have faith that the Justice Department can draft more artful statutory language than this.

I ask unanimous consent to include both the text of the current law and the proposed change at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

(Existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman)

#### § 1073. Flight to avoid prosecution or giving testimony.

Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, [for murder, kidnapping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony, or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, or attempt to commit any of the foregoing offenses as they are defined either at common law or by the laws of the place from which the fugitive flees,] *for a crime or an attempt to commit a crime, punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding one year under the laws of the place from which the fugitive flees, or* (2) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceedings in such place in which the commission of an offense punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary is charged, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Violations of this section may be prosecuted only in the Federal judicial district in which the original crime was alleged to have been committed or in which the person was held in custody or confinement.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. The several bills which have been described as the package of bills to more effectively fight organized crime were the subject of public hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary. Included, of course, was the fugitive flight bill. I share the belief just expressed so eloquently by the distinguished Senator from Oregon that it is not the purpose of the Department of Justice, in recommending the bill under discussion, along with the other crime package items, to do anything more than effectively arm America in its efforts to suppress, repress, and, if possible, destroy organized crime. As far as I can recall, there was no voice raised at any of the hearings on amending the Fugitive Felon Act which raised the possibilities recited by the Senator from Oregon; no opposition was filed if my memory is correct.

The Federal Government should not be in the business of seeking out the person who skinned a carcass in Oregon; nor certainly to enforce laws which reflect strong regional traditions but which offend the conscience of a majority of Americans. I can assure the Senator from Oregon that it is not the intention of the Department of Justice to move in these extreme cases. The suggestion of the Senator, that it might be possible to more artfully draft language in order to hit the target which all of us surely desire to hit, may be a very helpful suggestion.

The RECORD, I feel certain, will be read by all of us, including the Department. I thank the delightful—if it is permitted to use that word together with the traditional “distinguished”—Senator from Oregon for having so effectively made the point. I wish that voices in this tone had been raised while the committee was considering the question, because very frankly, I think the possibilities were noted by none of us.

I think it important, in our consideration of this question, to understand that in the institution of any proceeding under the fugitive felon law, the Department of Justice itself, by several of its regulations, spells out measures which may very well insure against some of the consequences which the Senator from Oregon indicated might be offensive. Indeed, the normal practice of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, when any U.S. attorney requests an investigation of a matter of doubtful propriety, is to bring to the attention of the appropriate division of the Department of Justice such a proposal, with a request that the Department express its views.

As we study the subject, let us remember that under the present law the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice administers and supervises the enforcement of the Fugitive Felon Act. This is the present arrangement. I am sure it would remain so in the event that this or any other appropriate amendment were agreed to. It is my understanding that the decision as to whether an indictment is to be returned in Fugitive Felon Act cases can be made only by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division. All of this should be in our mind as we



been publicly calling it vital. But in fact, unless its political instincts overcome its ideas of military strategy, the White House has no intention of including among its proposals to Congress on Wednesday any boost in bomber buying.

To understand this big negative fact—which may astonish not only Congressmen but many investors who've been bidding up aircraft stocks—it's necessary to know how the administration looks at its own strengths and weaknesses vis-a-vis the Communist bloc.

#### SEE NO MISSILE GAP

It has decided there is no gap whatever in present U.S. capacity to deliver nuclear warheads on strategic Red targets, either by rocket or aircraft. Quite the contrary, White House advisors calculate we have more than enough. The recent display of new Russian warplanes at the Tushino Air Show in no way altered the administration's estimate that America retains a clear superiority in atomic delivery. And it is firmly believed that Khrushchev is fully aware of this U.S. nuclear strength.

Hence it has been decided that just one major thing needs to be done to our nuclear capability as the Berlin showdown approaches: It must be put in a greater state of readiness for quick action.

For instance, the Strategic Air Command will sharply and swiftly increase the number of planes on runway alert, ready to take off for targets within a few minutes notice. The proportion of bombers on ground alert was in any case scheduled to increase gradually to one-half, from a previous one-third, by next summer. Now, this is to be done quickly, and if tensions warrant, the proportion on alert may be carried past the one-half mark. This will leave them less vulnerable to surprise assault, and with the same idea work will be rushed on new radar and other warning systems.

#### THE WEAKNESS OF THE WEST

The great weakness seen in the stance of the West, as it faces pressures on Berlin and other areas coveted by the Communists, is in non-atomic capacity. The view is that this lack could easily convince Khrushchev he can make grabs without fear of real resistance. He could reason that if he squeezes just a little at a time, no one squeeze would warrant a nuclear response from us. What Mr. Kennedy intends to buy with his new program is the option to make nonnuclear responses into initial squeezes at Berlin or elsewhere—responses sufficient to show we are able and willing to meet the Reds on every level of hostility, climbing on up to the nuclear if need be.

Let's see how this might work in the case of Berlin:

Trouble could start after a Soviet "peace treaty" with East Germany: the German Reds could announce they were closing down the Autobahn to Berlin for repair of potholes. The Administration plan would have the Allies respond not with atomic war but very likely by throwing military engineers in to repair the road, with or without authorization. If this led to shooting, we would again respond not with atomic weapons but by throwing in conventional forces strong enough to lick the East Germany army. Then the Soviet would have to decide whether to commit its own troops—knowing that if it did so this would be war on a large scale, with the U.S. so deeply involved with so many soldiers that it would in the end employ nuclear weapons rather than accept defeat.

#### WRITING A BELIEVABLE SCRIPT

The thinking behind the administration program about to be unveiled is that if Khrushchev finds such a script plainly laid out in front of him, he is likely to back off without a fight, conventional or nuclear. But the script has to be credible, it is contended,

and this means more money must be spent fast on bolstering allied capacity to do things short of fighting atomic war.

Thus the program about to be unveiled is intended to make material and men available for every lower step of a struggle. To give one small sample, it will include cargo trucks which could haul more goods into a beleaguered Berlin if rail traffic is cut off. Beyond that, it will boost permanently the number of military personnel, speed delivery of stocks of battlefield arms and equipment, and expand capacity for hauling troops and their armament into troubled areas. The American effort, along with companion moves demanded of the West Germans and other Allies, is plotted on a scale sufficiently large to engage the forces of the Soviet and its European satellites in really heavy conflict.

And the buildup is scheduled to be rapid. Though so many of its items are borrowed from a budget originally projected for fiscal 1963, it is figured that roughly 90 percent of the program unveiled this week will take practical effect within 12 months and a major proportion before the end of this year.

#### THE KENNEDY SPEECH

The precise contents of the President's talk to a national television audience tomorrow night and his message to Congress Wednesday are still being worked out, and it's likely not all of the Kennedy program will be spelled out in either one of them. The Chief Executive has been urged to hold back parts of it for later disclosure as sparring over Berlin develops.

But however partial and impromptu his announcements may appear, the administration views them differently than it did the "quick, dirty fixes" embodied in two previous sets of defense revisions—the first soon after taking office, and a second after reverses in Cuba and Laos. Although officials were proclaiming belief in bolstering conventional capabilities at the time they put through the first two, in fact the bulk of the dollars were thrown into rocketry and other aspects of nuclear power.

One reason for delay in pursuing its philosophy was that the Army's ideas on how to build up conventional power were rated unacceptable; they would have tied down large bodies of additional men at such spots as the Korean border, and they conceived of old-fashioned divisions packed with supply and support at the expense of combat. Civilian leaders wanted the Marines used as a model, with lean and mobile units consisting principally of fighting men. This is what they figure they're in position to get from the current revision.

So the Nation will put more men in uniform than the current 2.5 million. While additions to ground troops would enable some filling out of thinly staffed units overseas, and enable dispatch of new units to Germany, the major emphasis will go toward expanding units in this country that are highly trained and poised for rapid deployment to any foreign trouble spot.

One possibility: The Pentagon may add a fourth division to the Strategic Army Corps, the service's U.S.-based fire brigade units that maintain a portion of their men on full-time alert for possible limited war duty overseas.

Navy and Air Force strength will rise, too, to provide a balanced expansion of combat power, and to give the troops their airlift and sealift.

Plans have been drawn up for making available more aircraft for hauling troops and equipment to potential trouble spots. This could be done with or without buying extra planes since the Air Force could shift more routine transport to private lines under contracts and free more of its Military Air Transport Service planes for readiness to serve combat areas. Likewise, more sealift vessels could be obtained by taking some

tankers and troop transport ships out of "mothballs" or storage.

#### LARGER DRAFT CALLS

The manpower requirement, of course, has implications for reservists and guardsmen. But it's also likely to require larger draft calls. Already, in fact, Selective Service officials have asked State draft boards to increase their pools of men ready for call to the 100,000 total that prevailed until 1959. Now the overall pool has slipped to about half that. Actual inductions have been relatively low, though they've climbed from around 1,500 monthly this spring to 6,000 for July and 8,000 set for August.

In a move to get results fast, officials aim to increase and speed deliveries of ammunition, guns, vehicles and other battlefield gear to men in the field. Though Mr. Kennedy's defense leaders have taken some earlier steps in this direction, there's now greater determination to relieve shortages and increase the flow of modern nonnuclear arms.

The pace and amount of training maneuvers, alert drills, and other such techniques for getting forces flexed for ready-crisis response will be stepped up. Military exercises involving airlift of ground troops to remote spots have been fairly limited till now due to the cost.

#### COST-CUTTING DRIVE IMPERILED

It's figured Congress and the American public will go along with almost any requested defense spending hike. In fact, the chief worry is that the Pentagon's efforts to squeeze waste out of the U.S. armament program will be brushed aside. Phones are already jangling with calls from Congressmen and others arguing that scheduled closings of unneeded bases should now be canceled, "because of the Berlin emergency."

"The pressures are tremendous to abandon these plans," comments one official. "The Berlin crisis is being used as an excuse for all sorts of special interest arguments, ranging from a plea to keep open a surplus arsenal to requests to expand weapon projects."

But defense policymakers plan to use the Berlin crisis themselves for quite the opposite purpose—to intensify their economy drive, as imperative at a time of rising spending. Determination is expressed that installations declared surplus will still be closed, and other unneeded ones will soon join the list slated for closing or curtailment. Steps toward greater centralization of procurement and demands for better and cheaper contractor performance will be pressed vigorously, too. Weapons deemed unnecessary for production will be curbed as relentlessly as before, officials insist.

Since the Soviets showed off some 11 new models of combat aircraft, including new bombers, at the Tushino Air Show outside Moscow a few weeks ago, pressures have been mounting for greater U.S. bomber production. The Kennedy administration sought no new funds this fiscal year, which began July 1, for B-52 or B-58 bombers, and requested only research and development money for the 2,000-mile-an-hour B-70 bomber project. Yet even before the Russian bomber display, the House voted \$448.8 million more for long-range bomber procurement than the administration wants; now leading Senators are joining the plea for more bombers.

#### BOMBER PROGRAM OPPOSED

Administration leaders, however, adamantly oppose commitment of more funds for bombers now. In fact, some argue the Tushino show was partly designed to spur such a reaction from the United States, in the knowledge the creating a fleet of B-70's, for instance, would drain the United States ultimately of some \$8 billion. Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric has pub-



lly asserted that the more than 600 B-52's and 100 B-58's the United States will have between 1962 and 1970 "are sufficient to give us a manned bomber strength throughout the 1960's."

If the administration's problem at home is restraining the enthusiasts, its difficulty abroad is inducing allies to provide enough money and men to fill the portion of his program which Mr. Kennedy is assigning to them.

The White House considers it urgent that the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty alliance achieve in practice the strength they've already theoretically set as a desirable goal. Besides this, Washington wants a few special touches tailored to the Berlin crisis. This would be a big jump at a time when Europeans are anything but enthusiastic. The British have economic trouble, in their balance of payments. The French have military trouble, in Algeria and Tunisia. The Germans have political trouble, with an autumn election coming up.

Officials speak hopefully, rather than confidently, about this aspect of their planning. Demands will be pressed on all NATO lands—with the pointed argument that the peril to be faced is not merely the loss of Berlin but the consequent crumbling of the alliance and the loss of all European to communism. But the greatest fresh demands will be placed on West Germany, as most intimately concerned in the Berlin dispute and the best able to bear new burdens. The Germans are expected to chip in with more cash and extend their present 12-month draft term.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, all of this planning is a part of the new policy of "raising the threshold." As I have stated many times, I am not at all impressed by this policy—particularly if political and economic sanctions toward aggressive Soviet moves are not undertaken.

As has been so ably pointed out by the great Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the cold war is a total war. Unless we are willing to take decisive action in the political and economic area, as well as in the military area, we shall lose the cold war; because while we stand prepared with military power for a hot war, we may find that we have lost the cold war. Indeed, we may find that by our failure in these other areas, we shall have caused a miscalculation on the part of the Soviets and brought about a hot war.

#### FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is not a Member of Congress who is not concerned over the continuation of a program of assistance to local school districts in what are termed "federally impacted areas." Also, most Members are concerned over continuation of the program established under the National Defense Education Act. It is deplorable that these measures have been stymied as a result of the controversy over the President's program for Federal aid to education. Had the proponents of this measure been content to take the approach provided by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and me during the debate in the Senate on the Federal aid to education bill, all of this trouble could have been averted. Under our proposal, Federal aid would have been granted by having the Federal

Government transfer to each State directly three-fifths of the Federal cigarette tax collected within that State, or almost \$700 million per year, to be used by the States for educational purposes. Under this proposal, there would be no controversy over Federal controls, Federal administrative costs, segregation, or aid to private schools. However, the proponents did not see fit to adopt this amendment, and now the legislation is hopelessly bottled up in the House Rules Committee as a result of these very controversies which the Cotton-Miller amendment would have eliminated. In the July 24 issue of the Post appears an article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, which points out very well the tragic errors made by the administration, including the President himself, over the Federal aid to education legislation. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE SCHOOL BILL—WHO IS TO BLAME?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Only a miracle can rescue what President Kennedy considers his most important piece of domestic legislation—aid to education.

At his weekly press conference the question was put to the President in these words: "The whole bundle of school legislation was torpedoed in the House Rules Committee and it is clear that one of the things that largely helped to sink it was the religious issue. \* \* \* Have you just about given up on passing school legislation in this session of Congress?"

Mr. Kennedy is not giving up on aid to the public schools. He is intervening privately with members of the Rules Committee and others on the Hill. There are ways to overcome the blockade in the Rules Committee, which directs the traffic of bills to the floor of the House. But they are little used and rarely successful.

Even with White House prodding, the odds are against the administration.

The fact is that the school-aid bill now lies inert under not one, but three layers of determined opposition. It is presently locked, bolted, and barred by a combination of (1) those southern Democrats and Republicans who are determined to have no Federal aid to education, (2) those normally proadministration supporters who are determined to have much more aid to education, including long-term loans to church schools, and (3) some key administration leaders who, though not wholly opposed, have little heart for any of it.

That is a formidable triumvirate of opposition. You will probably recall what happened. The House Labor and Education Committee approved the main public-school bill May 24. The House Rules Committee has held it up ever since with a coalition of the opponents to school aid plus the advocates of loans to church schools. Then when the Rules Committee received the amended National Defense Education Act, including church-school loans, the church-school supporters cast the decisive vote to table all the aid-to-education bills on the ground that they did not have adequate guarantees that the NDEA bill would be reported out.

There is no doubt that the President is earnestly and energetically going to the rescue. But the Kennedy administration must bear large responsibility for this tangled, divisive, and unproductive mess.

Mr. Kennedy was unable to win the wholehearted support of either of the two princ-

pal Democratic leaders of the House, Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Mr. RAYBURN has never been warmly for the school-aid bill and Mr. MCCORMACK has been quite warmly against it unless he could get approval for some aid to religious schools.

The Democratic leadership took great credit for getting House approval to expand the House Rules Committee on the ground that this would assure the leadership's getting its bills on to the floor. The reformed Rules Committee cannot be considered very reformed if the leadership can't get the President's most important pieces of domestic legislation to a vote. It can't blame the Republicans. The Democrats are in control; they run the committee.

It seems to me that the President himself has somewhat contributed to the deadlock in the House Rules Committee by holding back his position on the nonadministration bill for church-school loans. This gave silent encouragement to advancing the bill which in the end helped to stymie the public-school bill in the Rules Committee. As I read the record of the campaign, Mr. Kennedy opposed as unsound public policy the appropriation of any public funds for church schools, but he has refrained from declaring himself since the election.

It seems to me that Mr. Kennedy should declare himself openly and decisively on this crucial issue.

It is a sad plight that 437 Members of Congress have to stand mute and immobile, unable to act because of the power of eight members of one committee.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am sure that most of my colleagues join with me in expressing the purpose that at the first opportunity an appropriate amendment will be offered to a House bill which will insure continuation of the federally impacted areas assistance program and the National Defense Education Act program. And I trust that the administration will see the error of its ways in sponsoring legislation giving rise to such controversies as the Federal-aid bill has caused and will take the approach which returns directly to the States a portion of the taxes paid by the people of each State, to be administered by the States with their own controls and without another Federal bureaucracy superimposed.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to restore the amount that would be stricken from the bill for the General Services Administration, on page 24 of the bill, amounting to \$300,000, for the representation of the interests of the Government before Federal and State regulatory agencies.

This is an important issue, which should be fully understood by the public and by all Members of the Senate, not only because of the amount involved, but because of the principle involved.



For a long time we have been talking about the fact that in the Government of the United States we need to have someone who will protect the consumer; that the voices of interests pro and con are frequently heard; that Federal regulatory commissions sometimes become referees between conflicting interests, between companies that are trying to obtain franchises or permits; and that the interest of the public is overlooked.

I am a cosponsor of a bill, along with 29 or 30 other Members of the Senate, to establish a Department of Consumers. That bill is now pending.

Everyone but the consumer has someone to look after his interests. The consumer's interests are frequently overlooked. The biggest consumer in the United States is the Federal Government itself. One of the largest ways in which the Federal Government is the consumer is in the payment of telephone bills, electric bills, transportation charges, charges for shipping, and many other charges in which the Government has to pay billions of dollars a year as a consumer. This, of course, means that the Government is in the place of every taxpayer and every citizen of the United States, because they are in fact the people who are paying to the Government, which is in turn the direct consumer.

It so happens that in the act establishing the General Services Administration there is a provision for the protection of the consumer, when we speak of the Government. It is provided, in section 201(a), subsection (4) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, as follows:

With respect to the transportation and other public utility services for the use of executive agencies, represent such agencies in negotiations with carriers and other public utilities, and in proceedings involving carriers and other public utilities before Federal and State regulatory bodies.

That is, the General Services Administration has the statutory requirement of representing, before Federal and State regulatory bodies, the interest of the U.S. Government as a consumer, to try to see that it does not pay an exorbitant rate, that the rate is fair, and that the Government saves as much money as it possibly can.

The requirement of the General Services Administration to represent the Government before agencies is also contained in other specific acts, such as the SAGE Act, and other acts affecting our Armed Forces.

The General Services Administration has performed well in this respect.

It will be found, from the Senate hearings, that the General Services Administration has made a total of 58 appearances in rate cases before regulatory agencies, 10 involving regulatory principles, which, of course, affect rates also, and 7 involving permits and operating certificates, and so forth. These appearances have been before the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and other Federal agencies, and also before State commissions.

It will be found, from page 1119, that whereas a great many of the cases are now pending and have not come to a final conclusion, in the past few years, in certain cases that have been pending, the General Services Administration has ascertained that over a 10-year period it has saved the U.S. Government in excess of \$160 million by virtue of its appearances before regulatory agencies. The largest saving is in connection with private line telephone services, in which the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. was involved. The 10-year saving is listed as \$100 million. On an annual basis, it is in excess of \$16 million for the various cases.

If Senators will look at the digest of cases in which the General Services Administration has made an appearance, and which are now being contested before commissions, it will be seen there is quite a long list, beginning at page 1121 of the Senate hearings and continuing for more than 800 pages.

The amounts involved are stupendous, indeed. The possible savings to the Federal Government are very large. The loss to the Federal Government, if its interest is not adequately protected, will be very substantial, running into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. President, some of the utilities did not like this, and the principal one seemed to be the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The utilities have been complaining that the General Services Administration has been representing the agencies of the Government in an effort to save the taxpayers from paying exorbitant charges. In one period of 10 years, leased-wire cases with American Telephone & Telegraph Co. involved \$100 million.

In the hearings it was stated that not long ago there was a special committee of the National Chamber of Commerce. I am advised that the chairman was Mr. Ed Crosland, who in turn happens to be the vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. Senators will find the report at page 933 of the transcript of the hearings. This was the beginning of the effort to get the General Services Administration out of the picture. That report is printed, and covers a great number of pages. It is recommended in the report that the General Services Administration be restricted in its work or taken out of its work in representing the executive agencies, merely because the utilities do not like the fact that the representation of the General Services Administration is saving the Government hundreds of millions of dollars a year, which the utilities wish for their own. One cannot exactly blame them for that, but even when rates are reduced, the utilities receive very generous rates indeed. The average State commission permits a return of 6½ percent, or sometimes in excess of that, on the investment less depreciation, or on the invested capital of the company.

That is based upon the old legal case of *Smythe* against *Aimes*, which is on the investment of a company. The legal basis for allowing returns was somewhat

changed by the Supreme Court in the *Hope Gas* case, decided in 1945, reported in 320 U. S., in an opinion by Justice Black, in which the intent to some extent was to give the consumer a little better break.

At any rate, valuation and rate of return are the two things discussed. They are the only two things which are important in the determination of what kind of charge the utility is entitled to make. The two things are valuation of property and rate of return.

To carry the story a little further, after Mr. Crosland, the vice president of A.T. & T. and his committee submitted the report, the lobby started to work. They have been working in the Nation's Capitol on both sides, to try to get something done.

Senators will find on page 24 of the House bill, H.R. 7445, a Senate amendment which reads, as follows:

No part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies.

This is the so-called Allott amendment. With all due deference to my colleague from Colorado, this is substantially what Mr. Crosland's chamber of commerce committee recommended. We know the reason why they were pressing for it.

Let us see what the amendment would do, Mr. President.

All of the reduction in the appropriation is to come out of the allocation for representing the interests of the Government before regulatory agencies. This will mean that the General Services Administration, before the Federal Power Commission, before the Federal Communications Commission, before the Civil Aeronautics Board, before the other Federal agencies, or before the State regulatory commissions, will not be able to introduce evidence or to make any representation, will not be able to present any evidence or arguments having to do with rate or valuation. That will mean they cannot represent the Government in a rate case, because those are the only two things involved.

If one would go to a rate lawyer and say, "You can represent me in this rate case, but you cannot present any arguments or any evidence or build up any case on rate or evaluation," the lawyer would say, "There is no use in my presenting the case. That is all I can talk about." Indeed, those are the only things involved in respect to the amount the utility is entitled to charge.

What we have before us is an amendment which naturally the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the General Telephone Co., Western Union, and others would like to have agreed to. They wish to charge the Government very large amounts. The attorneys for the companies will be making their record as to why the utility should have the rate the utility is trying to charge, or why they should have a larger rate, or



why the rate should not be reduced, but the General Services Administration would be prohibited from building up any record or from making any argument on behalf of the U.S. Government as to the injustice of the rate, as to why the rate should be reduced, as to why the rate should not be increased, or as to why the interests of the Government would not be protected if the position of the utilities should prevail. In other words, the utilities wish to have the plaintiff represented by counsel and to build up a record, but they do not wish to have the Government of the United States—the taxpayers, the people who pay—represented by any counsel to build up any record so that the overall merits of the two sides can be considered.

Of course, if an appeal is taken there will be no record as to evaluation or rates which would be brought out by the General Services Administration before the courts of the land.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about saving money. These companies are doing very well. I am glad to see them doing well. They try to deprive the Government of representation to which it is entitled by statute under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, General Services Administration, for the protection of the public. They are going too far.

That is a very unfair, unwarranted, unprecedented, and unjustified step to be taken.

I invite attention of Senators to something else. It will be seen that the amendment provides:

No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies.

Under that language the act would apply to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and other regulatory agencies.

The argument of the proponents of the amendment is that the agencies are there to protect the interests of the Government, so why have someone especially named to protect the interests of the Government?

We all know that these agencies sit in a quasi-judicial position—and mostly judicial—with respect to hearing rate cases. Arguments are made on both sides.

These people would say to the Government that the General Services Administration should not present the arguments and evidence of the Government side, when the agency is supposed to be judicial.

Suppose that some conscientious commissioner on a commission wished to put something into the record, to have something printed, or to spend some money for a certain document to present the case of the Government. He would, under the amendment, be prohibited from doing so because it is stated:

No part of the funds appropriated—

For that agency—

shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Last night I was present in the Chamber when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] announced his intention to offer the amendment. At that time I expressed my appreciation to him that he would undertake the effort. We were delighted that the effort has been joined by perhaps the most eloquent and persistent voice in the Senate on the subject.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator goes too far, but I appreciate his statement.

Mr. HART. It is true. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say that those who would deny the requested funds for General Services argue, among other things, that the work would be a duplication of effort, because the commissions are there to protect the Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. I suggest that the situation would be similar to what we see before us. Assume the Presiding Officer of the Senate is the commissioner; the lawyers for the utilities would be present on the Democratic side of the aisle. The commissioner is supposed to be sitting in a judicial position. He is supposed not to know all the outside evidence that might be produced by the lawyers for the Government. The GSA, which might be sitting on the Republican side, would be prohibited from presenting evidence or argument, or making any presentation, but would expect the court to know where to go, what to get, what might be relevant, and what should be put in the record. The court is supposed to be acting in a judicial capacity.

Mr. HART. I find it difficult to accept the concept described by the Senator. Unfortunately, the record does not support the description given by the Senator from Tennessee. How inconsistent it would be to expect that a commissioner could sit behind the table at one moment, rise, put something into the record, and jump back in a moment.

But the notion that the commissioners are to represent the Government raises an additional question in my mind. The commissioners are to represent the common good, the general public—all of us.

Time and again in this Chamber it has been echoed that one trouble with the agencies is that they do not observe traditional procedures, and that they tend to go outside the record. It is argued that such action is wrong. Put in those words, I agree that it is wrong. Yet those of us who support the amendment are faced with the argument that such procedure is exactly what the commission should do, and in many cases, I am sure, for some voices which normally are raised in criticism of a commission which seeks to go outside the record.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that the Com-

mission should use great judgment in what it might call for in the way of additional evidence, although I think in an effort to protect the public interest a commission, like a court, should be entitled to ask a question or ask for some document which might have some relevance to the case.

Mr. HART. What the Senator has stated is true. If the Commissioner were to engage aggressively in the role of advocate, the Senate Chamber would echo to screams and howls of protest.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct.

What would have to be done by the Government in order to present properly the side of the Government as to whether a rate was reasonable or unreasonable? It would have to have appraisals made. It would have to make many audits of the books of the utility company. It would have to examine the figures submitted by the utility. It would have to look into what had been charged against expenses and costs to see whether they were justified.

It might want to examine into the reasonableness of some salaries that were being charged. A great body of evidence would be required to be presented on the side of the Government if there were to be a fair determination.

Apparently it is the idea of the sponsors of the amendment that either evidence will not be presented on the side of the Government, which would have to be presented in order to get a fair consideration, or that it would have to be the duty of the Commission itself to get all the evidence and present it on the side of the Government. If such is done, it would take the Commission out of the function that it is supposed to serve as an impartial referee or judge between the utility on the one hand and the consumer on the other, namely, the Government.

Furthermore, it is unconscionable to think that the Government should be deprived of its representation or that it would want to throw the whole burden on the Commission, which it is not in a position to carry it.

Mr. HART. If I may be permitted one further observation, I am sure the Senator from Tennessee can recite at least some of the many efforts which he has made to establish an independent and separate voice for the consumer at the level of the Federal Government. For one reason or another—but never because of lack of effort on the part of the Senator from Tennessee—such a course has never been agreed to by the Congress. But that factor will not deter him or me from continuing the effort. But here we are talking about a situation in which the voice of the consumer can be more effectively represented. The program would not require the creation, as our opponents say, of an elaborate new agency. It is something which is within reach. It is feasible and understandable. Let us at least do that much.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator for his attitude and his forceful statement about it. The resolution to establish a Department of Consumers is growing in strength all the time. Year



by year more Senators are supporting it. As the cost of living goes up and the consumer has a harder and harder time, there is more and more agitation and support for some agency in the Government that will look after the consumer. But it was never contemplated that the Department of Consumers would take the place of the General Services Administration and others who are supposed to protect the Government. The Department of Consumers would be there for the purpose of protecting consumers other than the U.S. Government. We have the largest consumer—by a thousand times over the biggest consumer, I would suggest—in all of the United States, to which a very large part of the taxpayers' money, of course, goes for services, and a very substantial part of it goes for the payment of bills to utilities, railroad companies, electric companies, telephone companies, Western Union, maritime companies, airplane companies, and the charge to the Government and to the taxpayers of the United States runs into billions of dollars on these items. The agency of the Federal Government which is given responsibility for defending the United States against unreasonable charges is the General Services Administration.

I have great respect for the Parliamentarian of the Senate, and of course for the ruling, but this language changes the construction of the language in title 2, the property management section, and other statutes. I believe the point of order should have been presented at greater length than it was.

It was also pointed out that if the General Services Administration and other agencies wanted to secure information, which of course would cost money—for audits, evaluations, analyses, financial reports—they would be unable to use one penny appropriated in this bill for doing so. That is made clear by reading the bill:

No part of the funds appropriated by this act—

Not by this title—

by this act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of arguments before State or Federal agencies.

The bill refers, of course, to "sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes."

Even the Panama Canal Company could be considered an independent agency under this bill. I am not certain of that. Housing is. The Tennessee Valley Authority is another one. No part of the funds appropriated to any of them can be used to contest a matter of a valuation of property or the rate in a ratemaking case.

This is a far-reaching amendment which is not easily or readily understood from a reading of the bill. We do not know how far it goes. However, the cost to the U.S. Government will be hundreds

of millions of dollars every year. The utilities would be enabled to present their side of the case without having the Government's side of the case and the side of the case of the taxpayers presented. It is very unthoughtful and unrealistic.

I wanted to make these few remarks this evening for the RECORD so that Senators who may read the RECORD will have these references to the situation when they come to a discussion of the bill on Monday.

I should also like to point out that in the House hearings at about page 1140—I have forgotten the exact page—there is brought out the connection of Mr. Crosland, the vice president of A.T. & T., with the incipency and sponsorship of the very thing that we now see realistically presented, in an effort to take more money away from the U.S. Government and the taxpayers.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HART. The Senator will agree, I am sure, that A.T. & T. constantly and quite properly urges that the Government operate soundly, reasonably, efficiently, and economically. They are often critical of our omissions in this regard. Is it surprising that in this case, this voice, which normally is insistent that we operate rationally, should suggest what seems to me to be an irrational course?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I suppose it depends on whether one expects to make a large profit by what he is doing. If the Senator will look at page 1121 of the hearings he will find a great many companies that are involved in these cases, in which the General Services Administration has intervened. They are the General Telephone Co., the El Paso Natural Gas Co., and Southern Gas Co. American Telephone & Telegraph seems to have most of them, involving the largest amounts. The Western Union Co., the West Coast Telephone Co., and the California Water & Telephone Co. are involved. Some navigation companies are involved also. There are a great number of cases.

I believe attention ought to be called also to the fact that even as matters have been going, the commissions have been very generous in what they have been allowing these companies. That they should try to take away protection from the Government in the future is most shocking.

For example, under the tentative decision by the Federal Communications Commission, leased lines of the telephone companies have been allowed a 7¼ percent return on investment, or on cost less depreciation. Western Union has been allowed 9 percent. Nobody will be trying to keep this down, nobody will present the side of the Government, unless the Commission can go out of its way. It is even prohibited under the bill from doing anything for these purposes.

## THE HIGH COST OF DRUGS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of interest in S. 1552, a bill which seeks to establish real price competition in the prescription drug manufacturing industry, to reduce the unusually high prices of these drugs, and to establish more positive methods of assuring the safety and usefulness of such drugs.

One of the Nation's fine newspapers, the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., has printed an editorial commenting on this legislation and on the hearings the Senate Anti-Trust and Monopoly Subcommittee has been holding on S. 1552.

I think that this editorial, which appeared in the Star on July 28, 1961, is a most thoughtful and well-considered observation and ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HIGH COST OF DRUGS

While much evidence is yet to be heard on its remedial proposals, the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee is making an increasingly persuasive case for the need of legislation which will reduce the unconscionably high prices of prescription drugs, while at the same time assuring their safety and usefulness. In general, we think the key provisions of the Kefauver bill designed to accomplish these results are on the right track.

As might be expected in a probe of an industry so vast and so complex, the Kefauver bill is full of controversial ramifications. Its main thrust, however, through a variety of means, is to induce more competition in the production and the sale of drugs, and thereby reduce their costs. The subcommittee record is replete with examples of drug costs (and of drug-company profits, as well), which are shockingly excessive by any standard of evaluation.

Among the intriguing goals of the bill is an effort to persuade doctors, in prescribing drugs, to a greater use of the generic (or official) names of drugs, rather than trade names which frequently command far higher prices for precisely the same product. Many doctors, according to the subcommittee, have refrained from this practice in the understandable fear that they might run the risk of placing an inferior drug in the hands of their patients. Other provisions of the Kefauver bill, however, are aimed specifically at assuring that such drugs in fact are not inferior, but that all drugs marketed are both safe and efficacious. This would be accomplished, in part, by authorizing the Food and Drug Administration (which now has the legal authority only to rule on the safety of drugs) to determine as well that they live up to the claims made for them as to usefulness.

A few weeks ago, at the start of the current round of hearings, we were impressed by the American Medical Association argument that every private physician must determine in the final analysis what drugs are useful for each patient, and that the new control proposed for the FDA might deny doctors access to drugs of possible value to one or another of their patients. In view of the testimony from individual doctors since that time, however, and in view of the explanations offered

by Senator KEFAUVER, it is difficult to believe that useful drugs actually would be kept out of doctors' hands. In a very real sense, the FDA already is forced to consider the efficacy of drugs in certifying their safety, for there are few drugs in the entire armamentarium of medicine which do not have the potential for ill effects on someone. In practice, of course, the FDA must weigh these potentials for harm against the degree of curative benefit which each new drug possesses. We see no inconsistency, therefore, in broadening this evaluation of efficacy, or in the separate provisions of the bill which would impose tighter controls on misleading or false information which might be disseminated by drug companies to doctors in their extensive promotional campaigns.

There are other provisions—most particu-

larly one which would modify product-patent rights on drugs—which require more testimony, especially that of patent experts. Indeed, the drug industry itself has not yet had an opportunity to present its side of the story. The subcommittee nevertheless has amassed a truly overwhelming amount of evidence in support of its charges.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 31, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 29, 1961:

##### U.S. ATTORNEY

Theodore L. Richling, of Nebraska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nebraska for the term of 4 years.

##### U.S. MARSHALS

Beverly W. Perkins, of Nevada, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Nevada for the term of 4 years.

John G. Chernenko, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years.

Thomas W. Sorrell, of Vermont, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years.









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

### CONTENTS

Issued August 1, 1961  
For actions of July 31, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 129

|                            |                            |                           |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Appropriations.....1,11,16 |                            |                           |
| Area redevelopment.....4   |                            |                           |
| Botanical garden.....19    |                            |                           |
| Buildings.....32           |                            |                           |
| Civil defense.....30,32,35 |                            |                           |
| Conservation reserve....13 |                            |                           |
| Education.....3,36         | Industrial uses.....37     | Reports.....25            |
| Farm labor.....5           | Information.....25         | Research.....6,18,37      |
| Food prices.....7          | Legislative program....12  | River basin.....26        |
| Food production.....8      | Livestock feed.....13      | Small business.....24     |
| Farm program.....31        | Manpower resources.2,27,33 | Sugar.....21              |
| Food storage.....30        | Natural resources.....9    | Surplus commodities....20 |
| Foreign affairs.....23     | Official Register.....1    | Tariffs.....22            |
| Foreign aid.....10,12,34   | Prices.....38              | Tobacco.....15            |
| Forestry.....6,17          | Public lands.....17,18,28  | Trademarks.....38         |
| Hog cholera.....14         | Recreation.....28          | Water resources.....29    |

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House passed bill to provide CCC feed for livestock in disaster areas. House committee voted to report bills for hog cholera eradication program and for lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments. House committee voted to report foreign aid authorization bill. Senate passed independent offices appropriation bill. Several Representatives urged enactment of additional sugar legislation.

### SENATE

1. **INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962.** Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 7445 (pp. 13121, 13125-65). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Javits to provide \$30,000 for publication of the Official Register listing Government officials (pp. 13149-51). The bill also includes items for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and Veterans' Administration. Conferees were appointed (p. 13165). House conferees have not yet been appointed.
2. **MANPOWER RESOURCES.** The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments S. 1991, the proposed Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (S. Rept. 651). p. 13099
3. **EDUCATION.** The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported an original bill to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (S. Rept. 652). p. 13099

H. R. 2345,



4. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Sen. Tower protested the recent release by the Area Redevelopment Administration of the "names of some 47 Texas counties designated as depressed or distressed areas eligible for assistance under the terms of the Area Redevelopment Act," stated that he had received "a flood of complaints from many of the counties affected," and suggested that "appropriate steps be taken immediately to change the criteria used and the procedures followed in the administration of the Area Redevelopment Act." p. 13107

Sen. Miller inserted an article discussing the designation of two Iowa counties, Appanoose and Monroe, as depressed areas and stating that "County business leaders look with favor on any Federal aid to brighten their economic picture, but they don't agree that Appanoose is a depressed area." pp. 13117-8

5. FARM LABOR. As reported by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee (see Digest 124), H. R. 2010, to extend the Mexican farm labor program, includes provisions as follows: Extends the program for 2 years, until December 31, 1963. Incorporates in the basic act covering the Mexican farm labor program provisions now carried in appropriation acts requiring employers of workers recruited under the program to reimburse the U. S., up to \$15 per worker, for all expenses of the program, except salaries and expenses of personnel engaged in compliance activities. Prohibits Mexican workers from being made available in any area unless reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers at wages, standard hours of work, and working conditions comparable to those offered to Mexican workers. Prohibits the furnishing to, or retention by, an employer of any Mexican for employment in other than temporary or seasonal occupations or to operate or maintain power-driven machinery, except in specific cases to avoid undue hardship, and unless the employer pays both domestic and Mexican workers not less than the prevailing wage paid in the area to domestic workers engaged in similar work. Prohibits the furnishing of Mexican workers for horticultural employment, cotton ginning, compressing, and storing, crushing of oilseeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonal agricultural products.

6. FORESTRY. Sen. Ervin inserted an article, "Pattern for Federal Takeover of Your Business," criticizing a "12-part Federal program to prod the 4.5 million small forest owners to practice improved forestry," and stating that "There can be no freedom to try new and different ways if all forestry operations must meet Government regulations." pp. 13166-8

Sen. Gruening discussed the research work being performed by the University of Alaska and commended inclusion in the Interior appropriation bill for 1962 of an item for a forest research products laboratory to be situated at the University for research on "the protection, conservation, and use of the vast acreage of timber that lies in interior Alaska." p. 13110

7. FOOD PRICES. Sen. Miller deplored the "tendency on the part of many people to blame food prices as the cause of the squeeze on their paychecks and savings accounts and, in turn, to erroneously conclude that farmers are benefiting at their expense," and inserted an article, "What You Don't Know About Living Costs," in support of his statement. pp. 13116-7

8. FOOD PRODUCTION. Sen. Keating inserted an article discussing increased food production in Japan and Formosa, "Meeting Asia's Food Problem," and he stated that "It is interesting that two countries in Asia which have largely overcome the problem of a food shortage have done it, not by following the Communist pattern, but by organizing their agriculture economy along free enterprise lines." p. 13111



ment was primarily for domestic consumption, but it reflected deep-seated Nationalist fears that the United States might compromise on China issues.

Shen is only 47. As former chief secretary to Chiang, he has the President's ear and trust.

Chen and Shen will be a tough team and one of the most personable ones to descend upon Washington for a long time.

Better Sino-American relations will depend entirely on what the United States has to say about the decisions it has in mind for the crucial months just ahead.

For the Nationalists, there will be no retreat on two Chinas and probably none on Outer Mongolia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] designated "7-28-61." The time is under control.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How much time is there on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That time is not limited?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is limited on the amendment. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield himself time out of his side?

Mr. HUMPHREY. How much time is allotted on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety minutes is allotted to each side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that under the unanimous-consent agreement I control the time in favor of the amendment. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to take time in opposition, I think that would be all right. But if he wishes to have unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes, taking the time out of my side's

time, I would appreciate having 10 minutes from the other side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have no intention of taking 10 minutes of the time of the Senator from Wisconsin. I am opposed to his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

#### KHRUSHCHEV'S PROPAGANDA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, over the weekend the first shots were fired by the Kremlin in a massive new psychological warfare offensive against the United States.

It is no coincidence that Premier Khrushchev is attempting the same double play that he tried in 1958, during the last ultimatum on Berlin. This is the threat of military force on the one hand and, on the other, the unveiling of the most grandiose plans for Soviet economic expansion and for increases in the Communist standard of living.

In 1958, Khrushchev came up with his 7-year plan for economic development, within a month of his ultimatum on Berlin. Today, in 1961, he is again promising the Russian people a better day, and trying to convince his own people and the people of the uncommitted countries that only what he calls American militarism and American aggressiveness will stand in the way of the bold new world of Soviet communism.

Khrushchev goes on the full propaganda offensive with his announcement of a 20-year plan—an offensive designed to accomplish three goals: First, to paint the Soviet leadership as architects of a peaceful and better world, who can be frustrated only by the Americans and their allies; second, to rally his own people to additional sacrifices in the coming months and years ahead; third, to make it appear that American leadership is lagging in peaceful planning, and is concentrating only on stepping up the arms race.

At the same time, another and violent thrust of Khrushchev's propaganda offensive is being concentrated against our allies. There was a recent story out of London to the effect that Khrushchev had told the British Ambassador in Moscow, between the acts at the Bolshoi Theater, that the Berlin issue might result in a war with 200 million dead. It is quite credible. We have to expect that between now and December, the Soviet leader will wage a bitter campaign of intimidation of our allies. He will go so far as to say that possibly the United States and the Soviet Union might survive a nuclear war, but surely Western Europe would not.

Khrushchev hopes to be able to drive our allies away from us by making it look as if we in the United States are hellbent for war, and the only way out of such a catastrophe will be for the Western European allies to bring us to our senses. He knows that there is some uncertainty relating to the Berlin issue in London. He knows of the pacifist

attitudes of some of the British and their deep concern over war. He also knows that the Scandinavian countries and most of the World War II allies are not too interested in a reunited Germany, and he has a feeling that the French really would not go to war over Berlin. The play will be to divide us from our allies and make the United States look like warmongers.

In the meantime, Khrushchev will continue to embroider on his theme of a Communist utopia, not only for the people of Russia but also for the benefit of the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. We ought not to underestimate this psychological offensive. Its impact can be terrific. The very fact that they are so radical and farfetched makes Khrushchev's promises attractive. If they were reasonable, most people would pay little attention to them, because reasonable goals are now within the power of too many people to achieve. What will attract attention to Khrushchev's proposals is that they are so unreasonable, so unbelievable, so incredible. This is the Khrushchev shock treatment. Of course, he adds, it is all based upon peace. In other words, if his plans do not work out, Khrushchev will say it is only because the United States, a "capitalist, imperialist power," in Khrushchev's parlance, will have denied the Russian people and the people of the world the beautiful new world that he promises them. All of these plans for the next 20 years, Khrushchev says, are based upon peace, and he expounds at length about how the Soviets will do everything to avert war, particularly nuclear war.

So here is what we face: one psychological offensive to divide the United States from its allies, charging the United States with warlike aims and ambitions; another to appeal to the anti-German sentiment and fears of nuclear war in western Europe and particularly in France and Britain; still another to challenge the imagination of the entire world with the 20-year program of the Soviet Union.

The United States is always the yardstick, the standard of measurement, and at the same time the "Devil." Khrushchev wants the Russian people to believe that if his plan fails, it is our fault, not his and not the Communist system. He tells the world that this beautiful utopia could be a reality if there is peace, and the Russians and the Soviets are dedicated to peace.

Khrushchev is giving the world lessons in psychological warfare. One day it is a threat. The next day it is the promise of a better life. One day it is an attack upon the United States, and the next day it is dividing the United States from its allies. The next day it is the charge that the United States is ready to make war; in fact, is driven by the desire to use military force. Then he paints the Soviet Union as going all-out to prevent war, to save the world from the catastrophe of nuclear war.

We should neither take Khrushchev's challenge lightly, nor should we even appear to do so—not even his fantastic 20-year plan. To hundreds of millions of



people, who have nothing, his projection will be tremendously attractive.

We ought to let the world know that we welcome this kind of competition. And we must recognize that, whether we consider Khrushchev's goals fantastic or not, the Soviet leaders are capable of making a great drive toward those goals. And they will capitalize on every gain they make as a victory. Every failure will be attributed to the need to defend the Communist countries from military attack from the West. In other words, we face not only a propaganda offensive, but an economic competition that will be in deadly earnest.

Khrushchev would like nothing better than to have us dismiss his 20-year plan as mere propaganda. Nothing would suit him more than to find us going into a military buildup at the expense of strengthening our own economy and social structure. Nothing would so fit into his long-range program in the underdeveloped areas of the world, as an American obsession with military planning.

It is extraordinarily important that Americans understand that a military buildup—which I strongly support—must not be accomplished at the sacrifice of our domestic programs, nor at the sacrifice of our long-term foreign aid program to increase the living standards of the underdeveloped nations.

Our domestic programs—our housing, our agriculture, our health, our education programs, for example—are vital in the great struggle ahead. Those who are now so ready to short-change the great programs of progress and reform in America in the name of national defense are failing to see the true nature of the struggle with communism.

We can afford both defense and progress. It is time for our Nation to recognize this fact, and to face the need to finance both.

To the moral challenge to the world which His Holiness, Pope John, has recently given the world, we now have added the bravado challenge of economic and social competition from a Soviet leadership which claims to be superior to the democracies in every respect.

The moral challenge is one that we can and should readily accept. It is right, it is moral, to work for the better life of people who have little or nothing.

We have the system, the modern, democratic society, whose goals are to meet man's material needs and at the same time to guard his fundamental liberties. We do not ask men to give up one for the other. We offer not bread alone.

The Communist challenge which has now resounded around the world should be met head on. It is a challenge which we should boldly, eagerly seek. Khrushchev has given us the opportunity to set forth, and to demonstrate, what a welfare and free society, based upon free institutions, can accomplish.

Cooperation and competition can out-produce communism. The modern democratic welfare state can submerge the efforts of communism—if we but choose to muster our strength and courage.

We should be ready to join the issue at once. Let us lay out our own long-range plans. Let us go on the offensive with

our superior system, our superior programs, our superior management.

Let us set forth for the world our specific goals, our specific objectives—what do we intend to do, and how do we intend to accomplish it—what do we plan for ourselves, and what are we willing to plan with our allies and friends?

Where will the United States be, where will our allies of the West be, where will our friends in the developing nations be if they will join us to build schools, to train doctors, to raise farm production, to clear slums, to destroy poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance?

They will be ahead, far, far ahead, of anything the Communist planners can accomplish. This is what we can say to the world, and this is what we must say to the world: That the democracies are ready to move forward in unison on all fronts, that while we will fight to protect ourselves, our drive for a better and peaceful world will never falter.

Though we arm, we also work. Though we spend new billions for weapons, we will not forget our basic purpose: to build, to create, to improve, to progress.

The democracies will defend themselves with arms if necessary. But the world must understand that the hope of the democracies is not for war, but for peace. It must understand that the strength of the democracies extends not only to our arms, but to our programs for a world in which there is both plenty and freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois yield me 5 more minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 more minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What the Red Program Leaves Out." The editorial was published in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHAT THE RED PROGRAM LEAVES OUT

The second program of the Soviet Union's Communist Party says a good deal at great length. It promises much—and much of what it promises reveals the great shortcomings that exist in the Communist paradise. But the world at large would be foolish to deny the material progress of the Soviet Union since Nikolai Lenin drew up the first party blueprint in 1919. It would be equal folly to minimize the economic potentials of Soviet society, now, that it has built up such a huge productive plant.

What is more to the point at this stage of world history is to realize the massive factor that Khrushchev (like Lenin) left out of his complex equation. That is the cost—in human terms.

There is the cost of the Red revolution, in the first place. Soviet iconography is full of heroic pictures of the heroes of the struggles against the czars, the liberals, and the foreign troops that marked the early years of the Communist seizure of power. But when a great Russian poet sought to describe, in "Dr. Zhivago," what this struggle

had meant to ordinary men and women—the grinding hardships, the ruthless slaughter, the perversion of every kind and gracious emotion to the uses of tyranny, the gray monotony of thought and culture—he was hounded and his work suppressed.

Boris Pasternak, and all he stood for, are omitted from the party program, of course. But freemen cannot read that document except by the light that comes from "Dr. Zhivago."

It was not only the revolution itself that cost Russia dearly. There were the palace revolutions that brought first Stalin, then Khrushchev to power—each with its train of executions and reprisals, many, no doubt, wholly unrecorded. And there was Stalin's "liquidation of the kulaks," the revolution on the farms that brought death by forms of law or starvation to millions. And there was the Great Patriotic War.

"The Soviet Union," the program asserts, "saved humanity from Fascist enslavement." Millions died in the Soviet Union as a result of the war against Hitler, and no one can deny what those sacrifices meant in breaking the Nazi war machine. But would that machine have ever started rolling if Stalin had not made his pact with the Nazi dictator? If Hitler had not felt free of danger (more, had not received potent aid) from the East—to settle matters in the West?

And when the war was ended, and the nations of the West sought nothing more than to bind up their wounds and feed the hungry, Stalin stood sullenly under arms, refusing help, rebuffing friendship, adding immeasurably to the task of rebuilding his own country and poisoning the peace. What did the Soviet peoples pay for Stalin's ambitions then? What are they still paying?

The program speaks of peaceful coexistence as essential and warns that foreign complications and the diversion of national energies to armaments may delay the promised achievements. But it does not mention that Khrushchev precipitated the Berlin crisis. It calls the United States an "international gendarme," omitting to state that it was the theft of Czechoslovakia and the intended burglary of Greece and Turkey that forced a reluctant America into that ungrateful role.

New nations look with interest on what the Soviet Union has accomplished. Some are anxious to emulate those achievements. But it would be well if all were to seek through Soviet history for some idea of what the cost will be. They cannot know the full toll. For not only is much of what the Soviet people paid for their revolution secret. The grim fact is that the bill is not yet paid in full.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a Reuters dispatch from London, entitled "Europe Is Skeptical of Communists' 'Paradise on Earth'"; and also an article entitled "New Red Plan Is a Catalog of Failures," which also was published today in the Washington Post; also an article entitled "Communism Is Defined by Moscow," which article was also published today in the Washington Post. I commend all these to the attention of my colleagues and of all the rest of the American people.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1961]  
EUROPE IS SKEPTICAL OF COMMUNISTS' "PARADISE ON EARTH"

LONDON, July 30.—Russia's new 20-year plan got a skeptical reception in Europe to-



## THEY PREFER THE BALLOT

Yet despite this, the Filipino people have continued to prefer the ballot box as their means of changing a government. It is a fine tribute to their political maturity.

This year's election will be between President Garcia, running for his second term, and Diosdado Macapagal, current Vice President, who belongs to the opposition Liberal Party.

The election will be fought entirely on domestic issues, because in the realm of foreign affairs both men think alike. Both are staunchly pro-Americans. Both are staunchly anti-Communist.

President Garcia outlawed the Communist Party. He has declared that even though America, under European pressure, may be forced to recognize Red China and go along with its admittance to the United Nations, he himself will never do so.

Macapagal accuses Garcia of being soft on communism.

The Philippines was among the first of America's friends to send troops to Korea. The Philippines was the first to stand shoulder to shoulder with the United States when it became clear that Russia's Khrushchev was determined to make Laos a crucial test in his new war of nerves with President Kennedy. Britain and France wavered. The Philippines stood firm—and still is prepared to fight if the need arises.

Of course the two nations have their points of friction. Filipinos feel the United States tends to take them and their friendship for granted. They feel like the little brother whom a big brother ignores. They wonder why the United States has not made more of the success story of Philippine independence in the current struggle for men's minds and hearts.

Americans have too often been preoccupied with the fumbblings and shortcomings of this new republic, modeled so exactly after their own. They have not seen it—as it should be seen—as one of the world's finest monuments, because it is a living monument to the American ideal of total freedom against total tyranny.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 more minute.

## CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE SUPPORTS ACT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an excellent statement in support of the Act for International Development, S. 1983, prepared by the Catholic Association for International Peace. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## STATEMENT ON THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

The executive council of the Catholic Association for International Peace supports the bills on foreign aid, S. 1983 and H.R. 7372, presented concurrently to both Houses of Congress, and urges their prompt passage.

Each bill is divided into the "Act for International Development" and the "International Peace and Security Act." The former deals with the subject of economic assistance to developing nations and the latter

with military assistance to allies in the cold war.

The new money authorizations requested for fiscal year 1962 are \$2.59 billion for all forms of economic assistance and \$1.9 billion for military assistance. Of the \$2.59 billion for economic assistance, appropriated funds will be required for \$1.69 billion and the balance, \$900 million, will not require appropriation of funds but will come from long-term borrowing authority. In addition, the bills provide for \$1.6 billion in long-term borrowing authority for each of the 4 succeeding years, plus the authority to use approximately \$300 million from loan repayments for the same 5-year period. Development loans repayable in dollars will be made from the long-term borrowing authority.

The executive council is pleased to note that the substance of most of the recommendations of the CAIP in 1959 have been incorporated in the new bills. The CAIP stated at that time:

"(1) That there be an adequate military assistance program designed to promote the mutual defense of the United States and its allies;

"(2) That the mutual security program should be restricted to military assistance, including limited defense support; and economic assistance should be enacted in separate legislation on a long-term continuing basis;

"(3) That the objectives of economic assistance to low-income countries should emphasize the national purpose of the United States to further the ends of social justice in the world community; and

"(4) That social and fiscal reforms necessary to further the ends of social justice and sound development should be pursued vigorously."

We believe that the separation of the long-term social and economic objectives of the Act for International Development from the hopefully short-term objectives of the International Peace and Security Act is a decided gain in the direction of a more effective foreign aid program. Too many times in the past we have heard friends of the United States from the developing countries say that our aid efforts are not always fully appreciated when the peoples in these countries are led to believe that our only motivation for these efforts stems from the cold war.

It is, therefore, our conviction that if the motivations for economic assistance to the developing areas are known in terms of our advocacy of social justice, and not merely as a reaction to Communist threats, our aid efforts will be more effective—and, in the long run, our national interests will be better served. Moreover, the condition that countries receiving developmental assistance make genuine efforts toward internal reform, where necessary, and take steps toward securing social and economic justice for their own citizens is a positive measure which we strongly endorse.

The heart of the economic assistance bill is the proposed long-term authority for loans repayable in dollars. These loans will be made to assist developing countries in long-range development plans and not for a series of unrelated projects. The long-term authority will enable the United States to make an adequate commitment to help the receiving governments introduce the necessary reforms with less difficulty. With prudent congressional safeguards consistent with our traditional concept of checks and balances, the long-term authority should go far to accomplish the basic objectives of our foreign aid policies.

We do not think that the foreign economic assistance which the current bills authorize is an undue burden on the American people. Most of our aid is now tied to U.S. goods and services which will offset any adverse effects on the U.S. balance of payments from capital outflow and the total

new money requested for economic assistance during fiscal year 1962 is only one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product. Of this amount more than one-third will be repaid in dollars.

It is our opinion that if the President were to go to the American people with a renewed plea for support of the aid bill, the results would be overwhelmingly favorable provided that his plea were based primarily on the startling contrast between the affluence of our society and the abject, almost unbelievable conditions under which so many millions of people exist in the developing countries of the world. This view is further buttressed by the recent encyclical of Pope John XXIII which states, among other things, "Given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persists."

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] No. 7-28-61—D, which would restore funds to the Transportation and Public Utilities Service of the General Services Administration for use in representation of the Government as a consumer before regulatory agencies and would also eliminate restrictive language included in the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee which would, in effect, gut this important service of the GSA.

Mr. President, I am shocked and dismayed by the possibility that an extremely important function of Government may be hopelessly crippled, to the detriment of citizens not only as taxpayers, but as consumers of services supplied by various utilities and carriers subject to local, State, and Federal regulation. The adoption of the amendment of the Appropriations Committee to the independent offices appropriation bill which would have this effect would rebound to the benefit only of those interests that would, of course, prefer no regulation at all for the protection of the consumer.

The work of the Transportation and Public Utilities Service of GSA in representing the Government as a consumer before regulatory agencies is one of the most useful functions of the Government of which I am aware. It is inconceivable to me that Congress would willingly strip the agency of its power, indeed, its statutory duty, to do whatever is possible to reduce costs to the Government of services it uses.

The fact of the great savings which have accrued to the Government as a result of GSA intervention in rate cases



is thoroughly demonstrated in the record of the hearings on this appropriation, and was called to the attention of the Senate last Saturday by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. This, alone, should be sufficient to establish the folly of cutting it out. When it is considered that specific savings to the Government of more than \$16 million in 1 year can be accomplished by the Transportation and Public Utilities Service, it is entirely unreasonable to deny GSA \$300,000 needed to pursue its responsibilities in this area.

The taxpayers of the United States do not want to pay taxes to support expenses of the Government which are unnecessary. That is elementary. Here is one specific governmental function that will save money and will save individual taxpayers from an unwarranted burden. Instead of cutting this appropriation, we should see to it that it is fully funded and adequately supported.

In addition, we must not thwart the program of GSA with the inclusion of language which would make it impossible to operate. The language of the committee amendment that would prohibit GSA from presenting a case based on earnings levels and property evaluations of carriers and utilities would, to all intents and purposes, negate the effectiveness of any action GSA might be able to take even with reduced funds.

The importance of this function to Americans as taxpayers is perfectly evident. Beyond this, it is important to them as consumers. Representation of the public interest before regulatory agencies is a difficult, complicated, and terribly expensive proposition, as all of us know who have been in that position. The struggle of the consumers for a fair break in these cases is one in which they are almost always unevenly matched with the giant utilities. Because of their vastly greater financial resources with which to carry on the interminable litigation required to establish a rate determination, the utilities and the carriers have an undue advantage which is, in many cases, overcome by the consumer only with great difficulty.

In this situation the intervention of the Federal Government can add great strength to the case of the consumer. As a consumer itself, in many cases the largest consumer of services for which rates are in dispute, the Government can be extremely effective in presenting the case for reasonable charges. It is one way in which the Federal Government can come to the aid of the individual consumers—a function of Government which has long been advocated, but, so far, ineffectively implemented.

As for the argument of the committee that this service of the GSA duplicated functions of the regulatory agencies, this is open to immediate dissent. The regulatory agencies are quasi-judicial bodies, established to adjudicate questions of reasonableness of rates and charges of the utilities they regulate. They are not supposed to represent, as such, the interest of one protagonist as against that of another. Thus, it is inaccurate to imply that the existence of a regulatory agency will protect the interest of the Government as a consumer any more than to say their existence will auto-

matically insure the success of a carrier or a utility in a rate proceeding.

As I have had occasion to point out, before, to the Senate, Alaskans have had long and disappointing experience with the Federal Maritime Board—a regulatory agency controlling our lifelines before which Alaska is even now fighting another water freight rate increase. As I understand the position of the Appropriations Committee, there is no need for GSA to represent the interests of the Government—which is the largest single shipper to Alaska—because the Maritime Board will take care of the matter. Unfortunately, we are all too aware of the fact that this agency has never acted in what we consider to be the interests of Alaska, and indeed the interests of the Government as consumer.

I am hopeful the reorganization of the Maritime Board proposed by the President will soon be effective and that there will be a healthy improvement in the regulatory processes of the agency established to regulate maritime transportation. However, regardless of an effective reorganization we can speak from long experience in saying the existence of a regulatory agency does not protect the consumer interest. I believe that, in this case, as in all the others in which GSA has taken part, the Government has a duty to present as strong a case as can be made for reduction of excessive rates and charges and the prevention of imposition of others. That case cannot be made if the restrictive language proposed by the committee is not eliminated now, and if the representation function of the GSA is crippled by lack of funds.

I urge the adoption of the amendment of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how much time remains to the Senator from Alaska?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska used 8 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require. First, I want to thank the Senator from Alaska for a very excellent statement. I wish to ask the Senator from Alaska if it is not true that the denial of the right of the Government agencies which are involved here to appear in the regulation proceedings, at least to appear to present evidence and argument covering broad matters of regulatory policy, will result in costing the taxpayers a tremendous amount of money.

I call attention to the fact that the Government's monetary interest in utility charges amounts to about \$817 million a year, plus \$386 million for communications, as the GSA has informed my staff with in the last 48 hours, plus \$2,106 million for transportation.

This is a tremendous amount, exceeding \$3 billion in costs. It would seem to me, in view of the fact that the Government is this big a consumer—and the Government is simply a proxy for the taxpayer and citizen in this regard—if we deny the taxpayer having representation of this kind, is it not perfectly obvious that the taxpayer is going to have to pay more in taxes to pay for these services?

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is absolutely correct. The action of the Appropriations Committee, which is very

shocking, is not only a blow to every consumer and to every taxpayer but also a blow to the Government itself.

We are now in a situation in which the administration is asking for more funds. New crises have arisen. We are told we must appropriate \$3½ billion more for defense. We are asked to support a tremendous foreign aid program.

This is an opportunity to save millions of dollars through the adequate presentation of the case for the Government itself before the regulatory agencies.

I am amazed the Appropriations Committee should not have seen that. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his wisdom and enlightenment in presenting this case. I very much hope the amendment will be agreed to. The amendment is distinctly in the public service.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that one of the greatest reasons for the real waste of taxpayers' money is that too often the Government is considered to be a "soft touch"? In cost-plus contracts and in dealings with contractors of various kinds, the Government is considered to be "fair game."

Mr. GRUENING. That is absolutely true.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly, when we face a situation of this kind with regard to the utilities which primarily serve the Government, or of which the Government is a very important customer—is it not apparent that if the Government is denied the right to appear and to argue on broad principles in favor of rate regulation, the result obviously will be higher charges to the Government and higher taxes for the taxpayer?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is a view supported by our experience with regulatory bodies.

Mr. GRUENING. That is absolutely true. I have recently returned from Alaska, where I saw a very striking illustration of that fact. The Government, through the military services, has engaged in almost nothing but cost-plus contracts, and the result is that the sky is the limit. It is said, "Give them anything they wish." That raises the general level of wages, naturally, demanded by workers in private industry. Therefore, we have an inflationary spiral, and the cost of living keeps going up directly because of Government practices.

The Government itself, which presumably is fighting inflation, frequently is responsible for this, because, as the Senator says, the Government is considered to be a "soft touch." It is a "soft touch." That is exactly what the amendment aims to prevent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, I am delighted to yield now to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the first observation I wish to make with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin—an amendment which I completely support—is with regard to



the ruling of the Senate Parliamentarian. I should like to have the record show that I completely disagree with the position taken by the Senate Parliamentarian concerning the proposal contained in the bill reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The language is:

No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State Regulatory Agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies.

In my opinion that language does not leave any room for doubt as to whether it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I am surprised that the Parliamentarian has ruled as he has in respect to it.

Mr. President, at the present time the General Services Administration has the authority to intervene in such cases. That is a matter of legal right. In my judgment, to take the right away from the General Services Administration can be done only by legislation, and I mean substantive legislation. That should come from a legislative committee, not from the Appropriations Committee. It is not for the Appropriations Committee to determine the legislative policy of the Senate.

The question as to whether an administrative agency, particularly one which is classified as an independent agency, should exercise the right to intervene in a case, is a question which ought to go before a legislative committee of the Senate and ought to be determined by a legislative committee of the Senate, and not be determined by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

I wish to make clear again something which is being overlooked too much—and I speak respectfully about the Appropriations Committee—that more and more legislative power indirectly is being taken over by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. This practice ought to be stopped. The Senate Committee on Appropriations ought to be made to understand with crystal clearness that its function is not to legislate but that its function is to pass upon money bills.

When the Committee on Appropriations proceeds to tell the Senate that the General Services Administration can no longer intervene in protecting the taxpayers of this country in connection with these cases which are brought before the Federal Power Commission, I do not think there is any question about whether or not that is legislation on an appropriation bill. That practice ought to be stopped.

I am one Senator who thinks an appeal ought to be taken from the decision of the Presiding Officer in regard to this matter. We all know what is going on in the cloakrooms about this. Let the record show it. The attitude of the Senate is that we should not draw the issue now, that we ought to vote the Proxmire amendment up or down, to settle the question in that way. If that is what my colleagues wish to do, it is all right with me. I think it is a mistake. I think the Parliamentarian is wrong. I think he ought to be overruled. I think an ap-

peal should be taken from the ruling, and the Parliamentarian should be given instructions.

After all, it is for the Senate to determine its rulings. It is for the Senate to determine, not the Parliamentarian, and when the Parliamentarian goes as far awry as the Parliamentarian has gone in this regard, I think he should be overruled by the Senate's overruling the Presiding Officer of the Senate. That is my position on the procedural matter.

I have been concerned about this question in the past few years. This is not the first time the senior Senator from Oregon has warned the Senate that the Appropriations Committee is going entirely too far in carrying out its functions in connection with money bills.

I think the Parliamentarian also ought to recognize that every presumption is against the Appropriations Committee in respect to proposals which are challenged as legislation on an appropriation bill. I think the Parliamentarian ought to recognize that the presumption is against the Appropriations Committee when there is any room for doubt as to whether something is legislation on an appropriation bill.

It is crystal clear that this is an attempt on the part of the Appropriations Committee to take away a right under existing law, to curtail a practice that has been followed time and time again by administrative agencies of this Government that have been intervening in behalf of the taxpayers of this country. These agencies have sought to protect the taxpayers of this country from being gouged, as so frequently happens as a result of hearings before the Federal Power Commission.

It will be recalled that some years ago the senior Senator from Oregon, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, protested on his own initiative at that time that the Department of Interior should not withdraw from the so-called Hells Canyon Dam case before the Federal Power Commission. I said then there was a clear duty on the part of the Department of Interior, because it had the best source of information to protect the taxpayers of this country, to come forward and intervene in the Hells Canyon Dam case before the Federal Power Commission.

We should not forget that under a Democratic administration, prior to the Eisenhower administration, that is exactly what the Department of the Interior did. Mr. President, the Eisenhower administration decided to withdraw. The result was that the American taxpayers were not protected in the Hells Canyon Dam case before the Federal Power Commission, because the best available supply of uncontroverted evidence happened to be in the files of the U.S. Department of Interior. The contents of those files never were made available to the Federal Power Commission.

I cite that example this afternoon, because the General Services Administration is, in many cases, the receptacle for the best evidence with respect to what is contained in its files that might advance the taxpayers' interest in rate

cases before the Federal Power Commission or before other commissions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield me another 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 5 more minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I repeat that the General Services Administration usually has the best available evidence to protect the American taxpayers in rate hearings. What is now proposed in the bill before the Senate, is an unwise attempt to legislate on an appropriation bill by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It would deny to the General Services Administration the right to come in and present in behalf of all the people of this country the Government's evidence available in the official files of the Government in regard to what the petitioners may be objecting to in the Federal Power Commission hearing or in a hearing before some other rate-regulating agency.

I am shocked that it would be seriously proposed on the floor of the Senate that we should slam the door in the face of the taxpayers of the United States, because that is what such action would amount to when we get down to the ugly realities. In this country there are selfish forces, like the private utilities, that would welcome any opportunity they could find in order to deny to all the taxpayers of this country a full consideration by the Federal Power Commission, or any other regulatory agency, of the evidence that the Federal Government would submit in regard to a proposed rate increase. Does anyone tell me that such a proposal would not be legislation on an appropriation bill? Such a question goes to a very substantive legislative matter. This is a problem that ought to be passed upon by the legislative committees of the Senate which have jurisdiction over regulatory bodies. The Committee on Appropriations does not have substantive legislative jurisdiction over the regulatory bodies. That jurisdiction vests in the legislative committees of the Senate. Yet we have received a ruling—and apparently a willingness on the part of most Senators not to draw the issue on the question—as to whether or not the right on the part of a regulatory body to intervene in a rate hearing before a regulatory Commission, in the interest of protecting the taxpayers of this country, should be allowed to continue.

Talk about proposed special legislation seeking to protect the private interests in this country at the expense of the taxpayers. We have not had the like of it in my 17 years in the Senate. All that the Senator from Wisconsin is proposing is that we should continue to leave it for the administrative agencies to decide whether or not in a given case they are satisfied that there is such a vested interest in the controversy that they ought to intervene in behalf of the Federal Government and offer in the public interest the evidence in their files.



Where would the Commission get the evidence otherwise? Do not forget that unless Uncle Sam offers it, it cannot be obtained.

Assume that a Senator is in the private practice of law. He is satisfied that in the files of the General Services Administration there is some evidence that he would like to have. He cannot get it. But the General Services Administration ought to have the duty—and it is a duty that has been recognized for years—to intervene in that case and, in behalf of the public interest, offer the evidence. Such action would not make the outcome final. The Federal Power Commission or whatever agency might be involved, would weigh the evidence.

The Federal Power Commission decides whether or not the General Services Administration, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, or any other Federal body is right in the premises. Does anyone mean to tell me that we would further the cause of the administration of justice by adopting this afternoon a rule that would deny to the Federal agency the right to intervene in the public interest?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I intended to ask my friend from Oregon whether the basis for the Parliamentarian's ruling in this case—and I share my friend's concern about it—has been spelled out in the public record, or whether it was merely a ruling without reasons in support thereof?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My answer is that Friday night I first discussed the amendment when the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] asked me about it. I asked for an advisory parliamentary ruling by the Chair. At that time the Parliamentarian advised the Presiding Officer, who made a clear ruling that the proposed legislation would not be legislation in an appropriation bill. I disagree. I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Oregon, who has made an extremely persuasive case. I think his reasoning is unassailable. He is absolutely correct. But the Parliamentarian has ruled, and we are confronted with a question of judgment whether we should appeal or vote the amendment up or down.

The Senator from Oregon has made a strong argument in support of his position, but for the time being I would prefer that we defer the question until we talk with a few more proponents of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In the past I have been concerned with parliamentary rulings made, by the Parliamentarian, in my judgment, without any adequate legal basis. I make that statement with some diffidence because the Assistant Parliamentarian is a gentleman for whom I have the highest personal regard. I believe he is an extremely capable and able

man in his field. He has written a book on the subject which we all follow. But I believe that when so drastic a ruling is made—and I received one a little while ago with which my friend from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is familiar, with which I disagreed—we ought to start the precedent in the Senate of having the rulings of the Parliamentarian spelled out by the Chair in some detail, when they are disputed, with some reference to the precedents. Then I believe the Senate will be in a far better position to determine whether an appeal from the rulings of the Chair, would be in order, and whether a principle is involved, on the basis of which we would appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

In this particular instance I think a real question of senatorial policy is involved. I share the view of my friend from Oregon that there is a tendency from time to time for the Committee on Appropriations to arrogate to itself a responsibility which ought to rest with the legislative committees of the Senate. I, for one, would like to see this kind of issue raised on a broad philosophical basis, and not because sometime in 1926, in connection with something which someone believes is relevant to the present issue, the Chair ruled in a particular way. This is a question of senatorial policy in my judgment which should be decided.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Oregon as much time as he desires. But within the next few minutes, whenever the Senator from Oregon has finished—unless the Senator from Oregon would like to put the question directly to the Chair—I should like to ask the Parliamentarian for a specific itemized justification of his position, because the judgment that was given to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from Wisconsin Friday night was merely an assertion that the proposed legislation was not legislation on an appropriation bill. The justification was not given at that time, and I think the Senate should certainly have it. I think this is one of the most important aspects of the amendment. There are other important aspects.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the procedure that the Senator from Wisconsin has outlined is a proper procedure to follow. I believe that the Parliamentarian should submit a documented memorandum in support of any ruling. If his ruling should sustain the granting of the proposed power to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Senate should sustain the ruling of the Parliamentarian, I think we would have a job ahead of us, which would be to proceed to amend the rules of the Senate so that taking away this protection from all the taxpayers of this country can be brought to an end.

If we should start this kind of action today, where would we end? In my judgment, there would be built up in the Committee on Appropriations a super-legislative committee, and using this action as a precedent, I do not know where the end of the road would be. I happen to think that the subject of administrative law ought to be very carefully considered by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, where it really should fall. I

think it ought to be passed upon by the Committee on the Judiciary and not relegated to the Committee on Appropriations.

I have several questions to ask the Senator from Wisconsin, but first I should like to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On March 11, 1958, I raised a point of order to the language contained in the appropriation bill, contending that by the provisions of the appropriation bill we were changing basic law. If the Senator from Oregon will listen to this comparison of language between the 1958 bill and the language in the 1961 bill, he will note that the same principle applies to both. In 1958 the language was:

No moneys appropriated under this Act shall be expended for any activity authorized by section 201 or by section 303 of the Act of August 3, 1936, except for the purpose of assuring that the executive agencies are not discriminated against in terms of equity, kind, or charges for services as compared to other customers of a utility.

It was on the basis of this language creating the exception that the point of order was yielded by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who said that he had spoken to the Parliamentarian and that the Parliamentarian had agreed that this constituted a modification of basic law.

I now call attention to the present language:

No part of the funds appropriated by the Act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies.

This language goes far beyond limiting the use of the money for the purposes authorized in the law. The language states in effect: "You may use it for a part of the purposes authorized in the law but not for other parts." That is where the modification of the basic law occurs. This language says: "You shall use it for all purposes authorized in the law except on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies."

I therefore submit that the argument that one can, by language, prohibit in an appropriation bill the use of any money for a purpose under specific law does not apply here. The weakness in the ruling is that it in effect states: "You can use this money for a part of the purpose authorized in the law, and for no other part." In that way it constitutes a modification of law.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution. I have made my point. I will summarize it with this brief sentence. In my judgment here is a protection that I believe these regulatory bodies and agencies owe to the American people. I do not believe that that protection should be taken away from the American people without a



legislative committee of the Senate conducting hearings in regard to the desirability of it and making its legislative report to the Senate in the form of proposed legislation. I am of the opinion that such hearings would produce approval of continuing intervention in behalf of the taxpayers of this country. Therefore I believe it is a great mistake to have this amendment in an appropriation bill.

The Proxmire amendment should be approved. I have had some conversations, since I have been interrupted in my argument, with some of my colleagues. The viewpoint seems to be that we should vote on the amendment and that then we ought to reserve this matter, not in connection with the bill before us, but as a matter of principle and policy in the Senate, to be handled by the submission to the appropriate committee of a bill or rule which will govern us in the future, rather than get off into a controversy in regard to whether this is or is not legislation on an appropriation bill. The problem should remain before the Senate. I intend to continue to press this matter in regard to proposals for rule changes if there is a feeling that this power to limit should be vested in the Appropriations Committee. I do not believe it belongs in the Appropriations Committee. It should go to the Judiciary Committee. We should have hearings on it in the Judiciary Committee, and establish Senate policy.

This is much broader than the bill pending before the Senate. The difficulty is that we are going to limit it to this particular agency in connection with this particular bill, when I believe what we ought to do is to establish a policy in the Senate in regard to the right of governmental agencies and, in fact, the duty, in my judgment, to intervene when the interests of the taxpayer can be protected by such intervention.

Am I correct in my understanding that the House has retained the amounts that are covered by this matter as set forth on page 11 of the House committee report? I read from the report as follows:

Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service: The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,475,000 for these activities. This is \$61,000 less than 1961 and \$25,000 under the 1962 budget estimate. The committee went into the activities of this Service carefully in the hearings and it was testified that only 50 of some 273 employees are engaged in representation work before regulatory bodies. The committee has not reduced the amount for representation but it does not want the number increased above the present level. The Service has grown substantially since its inception and the committee is of the opinion it has all the employees now it needs in the foreseeable future.

I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if I am correct that this paragraph in the committee report of the House of Representatives would carry out in large measure the purpose of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MORSE. I am going to support the Senator's amendment. I serve no-

tice that at a later time, in dealing with it as a separate subject matter, the senior Senator from Oregon is going to propose legislation in the Senate which will get this question of policy settled once and for all in regard to the Appropriations Committee acting in this particular field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Oregon for an extremely persuasive and eloquent argument. I yield myself such time as I may require.

I will take the Senator's advice. I believe he is correct. I think the wise procedure now is not to appeal from the ruling of the Chair but to debate the amendment on its merits and to vote it up or down.

However, for the record, in view of the fact that there has been an extended challenge made of the Parliamentarian's ruling, I would like to ask the chair if he would secure a parliamentary opinion which can justify the argument that this is not legislation on an appropriation bill. I refer to page 24 of the bill, lines 1 to 6. It is my contention that that language constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. I ask the Chair to secure parliamentary justification for the record that it is not legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish the opinion to be stated now?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; but before the debate has been concluded, so that this matter can be understood by the Senate when it votes on the amendment. On this aspect of the bill we have the argument on the substance of the bill, and we also have the question of whether, if the language is permitted to remain in the bill, we are legislating on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has the opinion before him now: Mr. PROXMIRE. In writing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would appreciate it if the Presiding Officer would read the opinion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is understood that this is given as an advisory opinion, and not as a ruling of the Chair. It is in the nature of an advisory opinion.

The amendment in question denies the use of funds in the pending bill for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies by the General Services Administration concerning broad regulatory policies on earnings and property evaluations of transportation or utility companies.

It is not denied that GSA, under the law, has authority to participate or intervene to a certain extent in regulatory proceedings, but whether its authority extends to proceedings covering broad overall regulatory proceedings has been disputed.

However, the Chair does not think that point is involved in this case. Conceding that GSA has authority to intervene in any proceeding, this amendment does not interpret or change any law, but simply denies the use of funds contained in the act to that agency for the prepara-

tion or presentation of evidence or arguments before the regulatory agencies when overall policies are involved. The law may authorize this action on the part of GSA, but the Congress, under uniform precedents, may forbid or prohibit the use of funds, even for a lawful purpose.

The Chair advises that the amendment is a limitation, and not legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to make one factual suggestion, if not correction. The interpretation was that this was a limitation on the GSA. The language is very clear. It states:

No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used—

It does not refer to the GSA—  
for the preparation—

And so forth.

The bill appropriates funds for many agencies, including the OCDM, FAA, HFFA, and a number of others. As I have listed them, almost 20 agencies might, under many circumstances, appear before regulatory bodies. This proposal would prohibit any of them from using the funds of the GSA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think what we should do is to vote the Senator's amendment up or down, and leave for another occasion a discussion of the nature of the opinion or decision of the Chair. I simply wished to file my caveat. I completely disagree with the opinion of the Chair. However, I believe the way to handle the question is to consider the whole question of the broad policy of limiting funds. The limiting of funds has the effect of denying to an agency the authority and, I believe, the duty of carrying out its functions under existing law.

Earlier in my remarks this afternoon I stated that agencies like the Department of the Interior had the clear duty to intervene in a case before the Federal Power Commission, for example, when they know that their files contain evidence and information which ought to be presented to such a commission in order to protect the interest of the public. However, I think what should be done today is to proceed with the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I intend to follow his advice.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon a question, as a matter of information. I notice that the opinion of the Chair is that this amendment is a limitation, not legislation. I have in mind a very classic utterance of Jefferson about freedom of speech:

That cannot be limited without being lost.

I submit that there is an analogy here—that the limitation in this case is legislation by its very nature. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations has



legislative power built into it, whether it wishes it or not. By denying funds to an agency, it can, in effect, legislate. But when in addition it prescribes the form of limitation, it seems to me that is clearly legislation.

I think it unfortunate that this limitation is in the field of Federal regulatory agencies. We know that during the past 8 years there has been much criticism on the part of some of us of the character and performance of regulatory agencies; that they were frequently not acting in the public interest.

There was the striking case of one public official who was denied reappointment on the ground that he professed to serve only the public interest.

It seems to me that the beginning of the new administration is precisely not the time when this power should be taken away from an agency which like the GSA has been a guardian of the public interest.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe this is the time for us to discuss the question of policy, either. I think it was important that we file our caveats today on the question. I believe the general policy ought to be considered in connection with the discussion of an independent rule.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the proponents of the amendment have used a considerable amount of their time. The opponents of the amendment have yet to speak. I would appreciate it if they would use some of their time now, if they intend to use it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who is in control of the time of the opponents of the amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Washington yield to himself?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield myself such time as I may require.

First, Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Wisconsin for not having been here sooner; but we had a committee meeting at which we were endeavoring to determine at what date we might adjourn—a matter very important to all Members, of course—and we were reviewing the amount of proposed legislation before the committee.

The Senator from Wisconsin has submitted an amendment which he has discussed for some time. The language in the bill could be subject to an interpretation that was never intended by a

majority of the Appropriations Committee. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] has an amendment which I would like him to discuss briefly, and which I think will clear up a part of the question that was discussed here on the floor, and also make clear the committee's intention on this matter.

So I yield such time to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] as he wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, there has been some contention made here, genuinely, on the part of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and others, that the section which he seeks to strike would limit a number of the independent agencies in their regulatory activities. Such was not the intent of the committee.

I wish to call up my amendment, 7-29-61-A, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 24, line 1, after the words "appropriated by" to insert the words "the preceding paragraph of".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to make clear that the limitation appearing at the top of page 24 of the bill applies only to GSA and to the Transportation and Public Utilities Service of GSA, as intended by the committee, and not to the entire bill.

I sat in during the discussions of the Appropriations Committee on this particular item. I think the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] will bear me out in saying that it was not the intention of the members of the committee that this language should apply to any Government agencies other than the GSA. There was before the committee much evidence and testimony to the effect that there were certain practices indulged in by the GSA that were wastefully duplicating the work already properly being done by the State regulatory agencies, and even, to an extent, by Federal regulatory agencies.

If there is a feeling that this provision would apply beyond the section of the bill in which it appears, as shown on page 24, and that it would go beyond the GSA, I submit that my amendment limits the language to the GSA. This, I understood, from all our deliberations at the time we heard this important matter, was intended to apply only to that agency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply want to confirm what the Senator from Kansas has said. This subject has been discussed in the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee. It was certainly the intention of the subcommittee by this language to confine its application to this heading, and not have

it apply to the overall provisions of the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Washington, who is in charge of this measure, will accept the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Will the distinguished Senator amplify a little, for the benefit of those of us who do not sit on the Appropriations Committee, the alleged improper activities of the General Services Administration in the past? The Senator spoke in general terms. Frankly, I did not know what it was the committee was objecting to that the General Services Administration had done.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I may refer the distinguished Senator from New York to the committee report which is before us, which states, at page 16:

In the 1961 appropriations bill, the committee promised that it would explore fully criticisms relative to the General Services Administration's intervention in regulatory matters. The committee has investigated the matter and a full morning was given over to this subject.

Those objecting to these activities have claimed that GSA's intervention activities in rate proceedings unnecessarily duplicate the functions and responsibilities of the established regulatory agencies, prolonging the proceedings, and interfering with the regulatory policies imposed by Congress and the various State legislatures.

The Congress has seen fit to impose the responsibility upon the regulatory agencies to maintain section and staffs within their own groups to take care of overall regulatory policies. Why should Congress now provide for the expenses of the other agencies like GSA to handle these specialized matters as long as we clearly preserve the right of GSA and its representatives to appear in matters in which they were directly interested?

The regulatory agencies, with their specialized staffs, have done an excellent job—and they have done so for years and years. They ought not to be superseded by this type of duplication, and I certainly feel, and concur with the feeling of the majority of the Appropriations Committee, that funds for that purpose should be limited. This is what we have sought to do.

Mr. KEATING. Has it been the practice of the GSA in the past to appear before State regulatory agencies? I notice that they are referred to in the amendment.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. The history in the testimony before the committee shows it has.

Mr. KEATING. In general, to sum up, the main purpose of the amendment is to avoid duplication. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. That is correct. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] may elaborate on that question, but that is the understanding of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of controversy in this field, and it is not new. It has been going on for many years. But there was no controversy that what-



ever was done or was not done should apply only to the activities of the GSA. So the amendment of the Senator from Kansas would entirely clear up that question and limit the language to the activities of the GSA. I hope the amendment may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question before the amendment is adopted. Why pick on the GSA, which is particularly effective in this field? It is an agency which deals with all phases of government. I think this amendment reasserts and strengthens the case for the change which has been made by the Appropriations Committee which some of us feel is incorrect. Therefore, I would like to be registered in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, which has been approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the amendment clears up the matter, because the controversy is over the GSA, regardless of which side one takes.

I would like to take 5 minutes on the pending amendment, as amended by the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon request time?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me some time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. The other amendment is still before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to know about this amendment. Will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have the floor. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon such time as he needs.

Mr. MORSE. I was called to the floor. Someone thought I ought to know about the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. It is the Schoeppel amendment. I should like to know the relationship to the Proxmire amendment. I should like to know what it involves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A suggestion was made that the wording of the language in the Senate bill would apply to other agencies in this field which are supposed to protect the public interest in various rate cases—the CAB, the ICC, the FCC, and other agencies—so what the Senator from Kansas is trying to do is to get back to the intention of the committee, that whatever controversy there was over the matter related only to the activities of the GSA, and that the other agencies could do what they should do,

be they public defenders or advocates in these particular cases.

The committee is only discussing the GSA. I think the amendment clarifies the controversy.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Washington. I think it clarifies it, also. I shall certainly vote for the Schoeppel amendment. In my judgment, that does not justify rejecting the Proxmire amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that controversy very well.

Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer put the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Now, Mr. President, I wish to take about 5 minutes to tell the Senate about the problem. As I said before, it is nothing new. It has been before the committee for 8 or 10 years, I believe.

The chairman of the committee is a little bit the victim of his own Frankenstein in this particular case. About 8 or 10 years ago the railroads asked the Interstate Commerce Commission for an overall increase in rates, amounting to approximately 10 or 12 percent. I shall put the exact figure in the Record.

So far as we could tell, there were no witnesses who appeared on behalf of the Government to discuss the rates, to protest the rates, or to ask that perhaps there might be lower rates, so I suggested to the General Services Administration at one time, in respect to the independent offices appropriation bill, that since the Government was the biggest shipper in the United States the Government should have adequate representation in any rate case, whether it be a freight rate case, telephone rate case, an airline rate case, or any other rate case.

The committee agreed with me, so a shop was set up, and representatives were to appear in behalf of the Government as a user and to see to it that the Government was not discriminated against as compared to other users, and to go into the question of whether the rates were justified or not.

In many cases this is not necessary in regard to freight, for instance, because the Department of Defense is the biggest shipper and operates under section 22 of the ICC Act, under which the rates are negotiated, sometimes at lower levels and sometimes at the same level.

Anyway, the shop was set up, and it has grown considerably. There are two sides to this coin. A practice has developed, whether right or wrong—and the Senate will vote on the question—that when there is a rate increase asked in a given State the representatives go to the State to appear. Some of the State public utility commissions—in fact, the Association of State Public Utility Commissions—feel there is a duplication of a lot of their work. There are questions of base valuations and earnings and some of the things mentioned, which are somewhat technical

to me—the overall earnings level, the total property valuation, and so on and so forth.

The truth of the matter is that either the State agencies are not doing what they should do in the protection of the public, and if they are, there will be some duplication.

In some cases the Federal Government would appear with its lawyers, and might have a better background on the case than the State agency, which perhaps would not have as many employees. Some of the agencies think that in some cases this work has been helpful.

Also, appearances were made before the Federal agencies. I thought that the Federal agency was set up to protect the consumer. The suggestion has been made by many people that when there is representation of the Federal Government before a Federal agency involving rates and these other things—even in the communications field—perhaps there is a duplication of work the agency should be doing itself.

The proposal is that if there is some duplication, because someone is not adequately representing the so-called public interest, it should be corrected, and so the controversy has waged back and forth.

In my opinion, the General Services Administration does a good job in the particular shop to which I have referred, insofar as representing the Government as a user is concerned, so that there will be no discrimination against the Government and so that the Government will be treated on an equal basis with everyone else.

I suppose, to be perfectly frank, that the private utilities, which are in favor of limiting the work, feel that perhaps the procedure requires more work for them or that there are too many public defenders. That I do not know. The argument has always been the same, and the committee decided in this particular case to put in the language. Two years ago the House put some language in the bill. This year the House did not put any language in with respect to the limitation, so we put in some language. The committee voted on it.

Mr. KEATING rose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will permit, I should like to finish my statement.

We put in the language so that we could go to conference on it. We took out part of the money for the agency. I assure the Members of the Senate that the problem of the money involved is not serious in this particular instance, because we fully intend in the conference to put the money back in the bill for the agency. There was \$300,000 involved. The controversy is over the language. In order to go to conference, we had to put the language in the bill.

Some of the committee members are vitally interested in the language. The Senator from Colorado unfortunately cannot be present today, I wish to say, due to the untimely death of his brother on Thursday or Friday. The Senator wrote the language. The committee discussed it in some detail. Some commit-



tee members thought it was too strong, and some thought it was not strong enough.

The whole thing is to go to conference. The committee voted quite overwhelmingly, not on a rollcall basis but by an informal voice vote, to put some language in the bill which would have the effect of doing away with some duplication. I do not think there was any member of the committee who did not agree with the language of the committee report, on page 17:

This prohibition will still permit GSA to appear before the regulatory bodies and insure that the Federal Government is afforded adequate services at nondiscriminatory rates and that they bear a fair and reasonable relationship to rates charged other users for comparable services.

That was the original intention of setting up the first GSA activity in this field. I personally think the language is a little strong. I shall vote with the committee, because we will take the problem up in conference, to see whether we wish to have any language at all.

I have told the GSA about this. They sent me a letter, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1961.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent  
Offices, Committee on Appropriations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962 (H.R. 7445), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, contains a proposed amendment relating to the appropriation for Operating Expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service, which is of grave concern to the General Services Administration. This amendment, which appears at lines 1 through 6 on page 24 of the act, provides that:

"No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State Regulatory Agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies."

It is our view that this amendment, as explained in the committee report, would seriously restrict and limit the proper performance by GSA of its function under section 201(a)(4) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of representing executive agencies in proceedings involving carriers or other public utilities before Federal and State regulatory bodies. We also feel that the reduction of \$300,000 in the appropriation recommended by the Committee, if applied solely to the representation function as provided in the Report, would likewise substantially impair our ability to fulfill our statutory responsibility inasmuch as it would leave available less than 25 percent of the amount expended for this purpose in fiscal 1961.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,  
Acting Administrator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So far as the money is concerned, I do not think there will be any question about that. In order to get to conference, because this has gone back and forth between the

House and the Senate now with respect to at least six appropriation bills that I know of, we put in the language.

If some of the agencies of the Government are not representing the Government as they maintain they are doing or as they should under the basic Act, perhaps we should enlarge the scope of the proposal and make the GSA the so-called public defender in all cases.

Meanwhile there is a controversial duplication, and most of the State agencies object to it. Naturally any implication that the State agency cannot represent the State in the question of rates is objected to. They are supposed to do so. It is their responsibility. Whether or not any of the agencies to which the Government should object are involved or not, I do not know. But a representative of GSA appeared in a case before the Civil Aeronautics Board on the question of raising passenger rates. In that particular case, after all the evidence was submitted, it would take a CPA to know all the questions that should go into an evaluation of the activities of the companies involved. But I always understood that the CAB could take such action and that that agency represented the public in the particular case in question.

The GSA has responsibility to represent the Government in so far as the cases in question are concerned. The Defense Department is removed because that Department can negotiate under section 22. I have stated the problem that is before the Senate for a vote. I think there are facts on both sides. I am hopeful that we can discuss these questions in conference. The committee discussion, so far as the amount is concerned, indicated that there will not be much discussion with the representatives of the House on that question, because we intended to restore that amount. It is merely a question of what kind of language should be inserted, and that question would be taken to conference.

I know that many would be opposed to the proposed language. I think the report of the committee states the problem quite well, including both sides of the controversy.

On behalf of the committee I merely wished to make that statement. It is a question that has been before us time and time again. In the appropriation bill introduced last summer some language on the question, was inserted and no objection was heard. The provision was somewhat similar to the one in the present bill. At one time the House inserted language which was even stronger than what is now proposed, and we modified it. The language was in the report, not in the bill, which is a technical difference.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have had represented to me, by a representative of the GSA, that insofar as the SAGE project was concerned, through the intervention of that agency we were able to save \$100 million. I was wondering if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee

could elucidate a little on that case, if he is familiar with it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am generally familiar, though I am not familiar with the technicalities. To the best of my knowledge, in the SAGE case, which involved the question of Government dealings with the Department of Defense mainly, the GSA acted as a sort of public defender. My best information is that the agency saved us a great deal of money. But that agency was not a State utility.

Mr. PASTORE. I know; but the provision is not confined to States. The proposed language goes beyond the States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I quite agree with the distinguished chairman that there may be instances in which there would be duplication. I know that when I was Governor of my State the telephone company had not filed an application for a rate increase for some time. Then suddenly it did so. I took the position that it should not impose the rates until such time as the rates were proved to be fair and reasonable. But under the law of Rhode Island the new rates could be imposed. Then if the authority found that the rate was excessive, the money would have to be rebated. I do not know how telephone users would get back the nickels that they had put into pay telephones. We appealed to the Federal Government at that time, and it furnished us with experts that we did not have.

Such action was a great deal of help to us because we were not equipped with lawyers who were proficient in that particular area of the law. We did not have the technicians or the experts who would know the complex computations that had to be known so that the question could be carried to the courts.

I go along with what the chairman of the committee has said, that the proposed language is only tentative, and is to be modified and corrected in conference. But if we had eliminated the ability to establish valuations, how could the SAGE case have been proved?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe the Senator is correct. In that case, if the State authorities had not taken the action they did, the case could not have been proved.

Mr. PASTORE. The basic formula on which to predicate a right should contain the factors of what the property is worth and what has been expended for it, and to those factors should be added whatever fair return on the investment the authorities are willing to allow.

Based upon what the distinguished chairman has said, I now understand that the proposed language is merely tentative language to be perfected in conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What the Senator has stated is the understanding that we had in both the full committee and in the subcommittee. As I pointed out, in many cases the agency renders service, and in other cases there is a great deal of duplication. There was all kinds of



testimony on the subject from representatives of State agencies. Representatives of their national association appeared. What the Senator from Rhode Island has said, of course, could happen in some of the smaller States that did not have the facilities.

The only reason I made the statement I made is that I wanted the Senate to understand clearly the history leading up to this proposed action and how it came about, because the same story has been before us for a long time, and there are two sides to the particular coin.

I am for the regulation of this sort of activity. I do not believe that any Senator has a better record than my own on this type of question. But I say that we ought to start nailing responsibility down sooner or later. Either the Government agencies are not now doing it, which would require some other agency like GSA to step in, or else, if the agency is doing a proper job, there may be duplication.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the RECORD ought to show that I do not believe any Senator has worked more fervently and aggressively in the interest of the consumer than has the distinguished Senator from Washington. I feel that in any instance in which the consumer interest was involved, my good friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would be fighting for the interests of the consumer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to make a brief statement, and then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

In my State the chairman of the State public utilities commission handles, I suppose, as many controversial rate cases in the private and public utility field as any State in the Union. He believes that there is duplication.

There is a very fine public utilities commission in my State. I think it renders excellent service for the consumer on the subject of rates. Perhaps some day we shall say that GSA will assume the proposed task with Government agencies like the Power Commission, the FCC, or the CAB. But when we get into the field of State regulation, we have another story. I can understand that some State agencies think they are properly discharging their responsibility. In many States, including my own and the State of Oregon, I am sure, they are fulfilling their proper function. I think there is good reason for the representatives of such State regulatory bodies to feel a little sensitive to the implication that Government officials ought to come in and tell them that they are not properly performing their function, or what they should do, when the Government is only one user. It is merely one of the many users of the service. In the field of transportation, of course, the big Government expendi-

ture occurs in the Department of Defense. Under section 22 the Department of Defense negotiates for most of their large freight. In the field of communications—telephone rates, for instance—it is true that they do not. In the field of airplane rates the situation is the same. I do not know what the percentage breakdown in the defense bill is. But whatever the amount the Defense Department spends on transportation, I should say that 90 or 95 percent of it goes for the movement of goods in which rates are negotiated. Therefore, of course, neither the GSA nor any department would intervene because we assume that the negotiations are in the interest of the Government.

I merely wished to state this matter in the best way I knew how. I do not believe that this language gets to the core of the thing. Perhaps we ought to have, for want of a better term, a public defender in GSA or in the Department of Justice, or in some other agency, to represent the so-called Federal Government interests and the consumer interests in these cases. As of now, it is all scattered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask the Senator a few questions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I promised to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts first.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I sat all through the executive session in which this matter was discussed. I also sat through many of the meetings when it was discussed for a number of years. It is my understanding of the amendment which the committee placed in the bill that the purpose of it is to try to do two things. The first is to try to add some language which will limit GSA to appearing before these various State commissions and before any other commission where the Government is paying for certain services in connection with telephone companies and Western Union and so forth.

The problem has been that GSA has gone in, and, as the Senator from Washington has so well stated, duplicated the work that was trying to be done by the State bodies, and I assume, in some instances—although I do not recall any—by the GSA.

The Senator from Rhode Island brings up a very good point. The SAGE system is primarily owned by the Government and operated by the telephone company. The SAGE system does differ from the situation in the various States, where the property is owned by the companies, and the amount that can be charged is regulated by the State agency.

If the language should be changed in conference, I would be in favor of changing it, but to except the SAGE system from all of this.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We say in the committee report:

GSA is able to make a significant showing of savings to the Government in connection with their study and evaluation of specific rates for services which the Government purchases in large volume.

This relates to the SAGE matter.

Their negotiations with the individual carriers have produced noteworthy economies and efficiencies.

Then we go on to say:

GSA's obligation to participate in major transportation and utility regulatory proceedings is not disputed. It is accepted that they should appear as necessary to represent the interests of the Government as a user and insure that the rates and services provided are responsible and fair as they apply to the Government, in comparison with rates charged the other users. What is disputed is participation in these proceedings for the presentation of evidence and argument covering broad matters of regulatory policy such as valuation, rate of return, and other subjects related to overall regulatory policy of the various commissions.

These regulatory agencies all testified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Two things that are involved here. I believe that GSA should appear to represent the Government where the Government is the user and pays these bills. However, it should not attempt to regulate every system. Where SAGE is concerned, where the Government owns the property, it is a different matter, and an exception should be made in that respect.

The other point is that we decided to take out \$300,000 in order to put this whole matter into conference and argue it out there as to how much was necessary and what language should be included. We drew up the present language to the best of our ability. I believe it has been improved by the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. I believe and hope that the Senate will adopt the language, because we want the GSA to help keep Government costs down, but we do not want GSA to interfere with all the State regulatory agencies and with any other agencies of the Federal Government which may become involved in some of these cases.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that this provision has been in the law ever since GSA was established?

Mr. MAGNUSON. So far as I know, yes. However, I wanted to read further:

GSA officials admit that their presentations do duplicate that submitted by the regulatory agency and other intervenors. They argued that this duplication is necessary in order for them to discharge their obligation under existing law (the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act). With this position, the committee disagrees.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington, who is a great champion of the consumers, if it is not true that in his experience what happens when a utility comes before a State regulatory body is that the private utilities are represented by the best legal brains and by the best statistical brains money can produce. Who represents the consumers? In my State it is the city attorneys. They know no more about public utility regulation than does the average man on the street. They may bone up on it, but they are the victims of the kind of talent that the private utilities can muster.

Wisconsin is one of the most fortunate States in this regard, but in State after State it is true that the consumer representative is no match against the brains provided by the private utilities.



What is wrong with having a public defender to protect the consumer interests? They spend a very insignificant amount of money. It is a modest amount, although it is probably more than \$300,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They spend about a half million dollars.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; it is a very small amount. What is the matter with having a kind of public defender appointed? The Senator from Washington has asked a pertinent question: "What are these agencies doing when they are not defending the consumers?" These are quasi-judicial agencies. They must act as such. They must be as fair and as considerate as they can be. They have to consider the kind of evidence that is produced before them. Therefore it seems to me that the only way we can get a balance is to do all we can to strengthen the hand of the consumers in these cases. What the Senate would be doing today would be to knock all this out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will remember that I spoke to him about this situation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What we are taking out is 77 percent, if we adopt the committee amendment. We are gutting it. It may be that when we go to conference we can compromise the amount. I have great faith in the Senator from Washington. There is no one who is more able and more sincere in this regard. However, we are voting now for a cut of 77 percent. Does it not seem to the Senator from Washington that we are put in a very unfortunate position? If we vote against the amendment we are voting against the interests of the consumer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would not let that be as strong as the Senator from Wisconsin indicates. We are dealing with a \$2,475,000 item. If the agency wanted to go ahead, moneywise, it can do that under the bill even with the proposed cut going into effect. They could still do it. This does not strap them too much.

Here is what is bothering me. They are supposed to take care of the public interest. That is what the ICC, the CAB, the Federal Communications Commission were created for, and I want to shift the responsibility if they have not been doing that.

The General Services administration was created—and I know that basic act from A to Z—to represent the Government as a user, and only as a user. In many cases they have entered a case and have performed outstandingly. They have gone out of their way and have done what perhaps should have been done by other departments, such as the ICC, an agency which is concerned with granting rate increases. In other words, the GSA has been assuming all the responsibility, but that is the agency where such responsibility should be exercised.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator from Washington. It seems to me that what is being done is to aggravate that kind of situation. Also, the commissioners of many of the regulatory bodies say—and with some rea-

son—that Congress has said they must promote industry, so they take that responsibility more seriously than many other aspects of their duties.

If Congress prevents the GSA from being even as effective as it has been in the past—and if I had my way, I would make it much more effective—if we cut their budget 70 percent or 20 percent, even compromising the amounts—if we hamstringing them and prevent them from arguing these types of cases, is it not true that the consumer will get less representation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, not if the other agencies are doing the job they are supposed to do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have been saying that, but we have been unable to enable them to do it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think Congress must change the procedure legislatively. Oh, we can say that this is not legislation. This question has been before the committee for years. I think we must decide once and for all who will represent the consumer. We can ask, "Mr. ICC, are you representing the consumer? Mr. CAB, are you representing the consumer? Mr. FCC, are you representing the consumer? Mr. Maritime Board, are you representing the consumer?" They are the four major commissions.

Instead of their saying, "Oh, well, we do not have to worry about it; we simply hear the side that wants an increase; and if he looks like he will make a good case, we will grant it; we will say nothing." Perhaps the GSA will enter the case, because the Government is one of the shippers or one of the users.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is there any dissatisfaction with the work the GSA has been doing?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes; we hear objections from the State utility commissions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Oh, the objections are from the State utility commissions?

Mr. MAGNUSON. And from Federal agencies.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My relationship with the GSA has been occasional, but I have always had the impression that they have been doing good work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In this particular activity?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; and in all activities with which I am familiar.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe that is so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If they are doing good work, why should we listen to outside utilities?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not outside utilities; the State public utility commissions. In some places it is called a railroad commission; in my State it is a public utility commission.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What is their objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That the GSA is duplicating the work of the State public utility commissions. Sometimes a State utility commission might have a plan or a proposal in opposition to a rate increase. They may oppose certain plans.

The GSA may come in and take a different tack, which the State utility commissions say, in effect, fouls up their proposals.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. In view of what the Senator has said, that possibly it would be the better part of judgment if this entire matter were reviewed as a legislative question, why would it not be well to take out the language at this point, restore the money, and make a strong representation in the report to the effect that this is a complex field, and that the question should be decided as a matter of policy by referring it to the legislative committees?

I am afraid that if these limitations are included now, pending cases will be affected, because none of the money could be used for any case now pending.

Since the public interest—the consumer interest—is so much involved in what the Government will have to pay—and what it pays will reflect itself back to the taxpayer—why would it not be better, in view of the colloquy of today, and recognizing that this is a very complicated question, having many ramifications, to write a strong statement in the report to the effect that the whole subject should be reviewed by the legislative committees. Let it be stated that we would expect the departments to protect the public interest; that we would not want this effort to be duplicated, but that we would not want to refuse money now for fear we might do irreparable harm to some of the cases?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the Senator from Washington will seriously consider the suggestion made by the able Senator from Rhode Island. It occurs to me that the colloquy has indicated considerable dissatisfaction among many Senators with the possibility of this proposal being legislation on an appropriation bill. It is an extremely complex matter, one which I believe calls for extensive hearings by the legislative committees which have the responsibility in this regard.

I am aware of the concern shown by the Senator from Washington for the public interest. He has spent his whole life in public service, protecting the public interest. I urge him to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island to delete this language from the appropriation bill, and let us look at the question as a legislative matter, which is really what it is.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to show how complex this question can become. First, I shall read the language under which the agency acts:

Section 201(a) (4) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, provides:

"The Administrator shall, in respect of executive agencies, and to the extent that he determines that so doing is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy,



efficiency, or service, and with due regard to the program activities concerned.

"(4) with respect to transportation and other public utility services for the use of executive agencies, represent such agencies in \* \* \* proceedings involving carriers or other public utilities before Federal and State regulatory bodies."

That is practically all the language there is which authorizes the agency to act. If we consider the amendment in the appropriation bill, who can separate these two requirements? Who can declare what will be permissible and what not permissible? I merely state the language of the existing law, the limitations which have been placed upon the agencies by amendment.

When the agency begins to act, it will be told that it may do certain things under the law, but not those prohibited by the limitations set forth in the appropriation bill. I think the suggestion by the Senator from Rhode Island is sound.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. That is the purport of the argument. Some say the GSA should perform in this way; some say it should not.

State agencies say that the GSA should come into a case only to represent the Government as a user. That is the argument. The GSA, taking its cue from the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act, offers another version of how far it may go. That is what the dispute is about.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what I say. I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Rhode Island is sound. When we try to separate powers in an appropriation bill we get into difficulty.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The act ought to be reviewed, and then a determination should be made of what should be done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the same difficulty which confronts us on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. This is the first year we have made it a part of the bill. We have always heretofore included some kind of limitations in the report, but to include it in the bill is a little different.

Mr. PASTORE. We are all cognizant of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Washington is the chairman of the legislative committee which has supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and other such regulatory agencies. Does not the Senator believe it would be a good idea to call in the whole array and ask them all in turn, "What are you doing? What are you doing? What are you doing?" so that we can have the matter straightened out? As it stands now, we are talking about duplication; but are we certain there is duplication? We are taking the word of someone else that there is. This is a question which must be decided. I do not believe any agency which is entrusted with the responsibility of protecting the public interest should shirk that responsibility.

If the GSA is doing all the things it says it must do, then some other Federal agency is not doing what it should do under the law. I think it is the responsibility of Congress to determine what is going on. I think the time has come for Congress to call in all the agencies and ascertain what each is doing to protect the consumer interest. I do not think that would be a difficult task. I do not see how it could be done in conference. Without evidence, without testimony, I feel certain that we would run ourselves into a labyrinth of confusion, for the simple reason that if the proposed language is adopted, and if there is any case now pending, the GSA will be compelled to withdraw.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Could we not accomplish what the Senator from Rhode Island is suggesting simply by accepting the amendment? That is what the amendment provides.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator from Oregon is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all right.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, before the Senator from Washington yields the floor, will he yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. At this time I yield to the Senator from New York; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, it strikes me that the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island should be accepted. However, if the existing language is to remain in the bill, I believe attention should be given to the difference between the position of Federal regulatory agencies and the position of State regulatory agencies.

I call the Senator's attention to page 1295 of the committee hearings, where Mr. Miller was being questioned by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I ask unanimous consent to include a key excerpt from this testimony at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### GSA REASONS FOR INTERVENTION

Mr. MILLER. Because the prices established by the regulatory agencies are paid by the Federal Government. For example, it has been estimated that the Federal Government pays about \$817 million per year for utility services, not including communications, and another \$386 million for communications. The prices for these services, are largely intrastate.

Senator ROBERTSON. Isn't it true that a utility, certainly under the Virginia laws, and I assume under all the State laws, cannot arbitrarily charge one customer one rate and another customer a different rate?

Mr. MILLER. They do charge different rates to different classes of customers; yes sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. But all customers in that class pay the same rate; isn't that true?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, that is correct.

Senator ROBERTSON. Now, there will be plenty of customers who will have as much business as the Federal Government in Virginia. So, I still do not understand why, if the rate is going to be uniform in the classification, you feel it is your function to appear in a State matter. In other words, it is claimed that GSA intervention in these cases has just been a device to build up a lot of personnel and to spend money that is not really needed for the protection of the taxpayers. That is our present inquiry. We want to know what good you are doing with the \$390,000 when you are asking us to continue—

Mr. BOUTIN. If I might, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call on our General Counsel, Mr. Macomber, who I think can shed some light on this.

#### AUTHORITY FOR REPRESENTATION ACTIVITY

Mr. MACOMBER. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, which is the fundamental charter of GSA, contains this provision with respect to our participation in these representation proceedings, and it is section 201(a)(4). It is short and I will read it:

"The Administrator shall, in respect of executive agencies, and to the extent that he determines that so doing is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or service, and with due regard to the program activities of the agencies concerned, with respect to transportation and other public utility services for the use of executive agencies, represent such agencies in negotiations with carriers and other public utilities and in proceedings involving carriers or other public utilities before Federal and State regulatory bodies."

Senator ROBERTSON. All right. Now read that again, beginning with, " \* \* \* to the extent \* \* \* " What is that language?

Mr. MACOMBER. That—"the administrator shall, in respect of executive agencies, and to the extent that he determines that so doing is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency or service, and with due regard to the program activities of the agency concerned, \* \* \* with respect to transportation and other public utility services for the use of executive agencies, represent such agencies in negotiations with carriers and other public utilities and in proceedings involving carriers or other public utilities before Federal and State regulatory bodies."

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I can understand how it would be resented if the GSA, in appearing before a State regulatory agency, went beyond its capacity of representing the Government as a user. As I understand this language, it is intended to continue to provide GSA with the opportunity to appear as a user of the services involved.

Regarding the Federal regulatory agencies, it is often true that no one appears to represent consumers, as such. I believe we should have a consumer counsel or someone else to appear before these agencies and to represent the consumers. I have introduced a bill, S. 2323, to establish a consumers counsel in the White House.

In sum, I would say that when the GSA appears before a State agency they should be restricted to appearance as a user. I also believe that they might well be permitted to go beyond their duties as a user in appearing before a Federal agency as far as the policies of the agency is concerned in the matter pending, at least until better Federal mechanisms are devised to represent consumer



interests. If the present language is retained, I think the conferees should consider this matter; to wit, that the real distinction, in my opinion, should be between Federal and State regulatory agencies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Furthermore, in all these cases there are only two parties—the party asking for the increase by the Federal Government agency, which is supposed to resist the request or to grant it, according to which would be best in the interest of the consumers. So I assume that the CAB would direct its entire staff to look into such matters. If the GSA appeared there in a role other than that of a user, there would be some duplication.

Mr. KEATING. Except that in the case of a Federal agency, as distinguished from a State agency, the agency before which the proceeding is taking place should maintain a neutral position as between all parties.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But there are only two parties when there is a Federal agency hearing. One is asking the Federal Government for the increase. The other is the agency itself, which is supposed to be representing the consumers. But these agencies seem to be slipping away from that position.

Mr. KEATING. But I question whether the CAB, the FCC, or whatever agency may be concerned is supposed to consider only the interests of the consumers. The agency is to make the decision.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. And in general practice there is really no advocate before them for the consumer. Therefore, perhaps it is appropriate that the GSA be an advocate for the consumer, before the Federal regulatory agencies.

I think there is quite a difference between that situation and the situation before the State regulatory agencies, which have their own setup; and I can understand how the State regulatory agencies would resent having the GSA, a Federal agency, come there.

I simply submit this matter, for consideration in the conference, if the language remains in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

For instance, in Florida the GSA made a mistake, and it turned out that the mistake was made at the cost or the expense of the consumers, because the GSA made the mistake in evaluating some of the capital assets, and so forth. That is the sort of duplication or confusion that is occurring.

I hate to see this language included in an appropriation bill. Although I think we should study the matter, I suggest that perhaps we should give the GSA twice as much money, and tell it that it is to be the public defender in such cases.

Of course these agencies would prefer to be quasi-judicial and to decide these matters in their long robes, rather than go in and really be the defender of the consumers. They are getting away from that; all of them seem to want to be distinguished, formal judges.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator from Washington yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, for I promised to yield next to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to discuss the substance of this matter for 5 minutes.

Let me say that in my opinion the Senator from Rhode Island is wiser than Solomon, for he does not propose to split the child; instead, the Senator from Rhode Island proposes that adoption hearings be held. However, I do not think the Appropriations Committee is the proper agency to consider the holding of adoption hearings.

I was pleased to hear the Senator from Washington say he does not think this language belongs in an appropriation bill. As I stated earlier today, I believe that, in effect, this language is legislation on an appropriation bill.

I wish to say also that whenever I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the disagreement has to be very deep, indeed. However, I could not disagree more with him than I do in regard to almost every premise he has laid down this afternoon.

I shall make my points in rebuttal very quickly.

First of all, the GSA has been doing this public service job for 12 years, and has been doing so good a job that in this country there are some who would like to have it denied an opportunity to continue doing it. It has saved the taxpayers a great deal of money, running into the millions of dollars. In my opinion it has performed in excellent fashion in fulfilling its public trust.

But this afternoon there has been much comment to the effect that the State public utility agencies are opposed to intervention by the GSA. However, that is not an argument against such intervention, because some of us know something about the activities of some of the State public utility commissions. I wish to say that in some of the State public utility commissions a great deal of Federal interest is also involved; and we must not forget that one of the largest ratepayers is Uncle Sam, and it is the job of the General Services Administration to protect the interests of the Government.

At one point this afternoon it was stated that some \$2 billion in rates paid by the Federal Government is involved. I have not check on the authenticity of that figure, but I have not heard it questioned. Certainly, Uncle Sam pays rates, too; and some of the rate cases come up before the State utility commissions.

So if such language is included in an appropriation bill, there will be in many instances both a judge and defendant, but there will be no plaintiff, or no effective plaintiff. What kind of a rate hearing would that be? In many instances, the party with the best evidence is the Federal Government; and if in a given case the GSA believes that it should intervene, then I do not think the Appropriations Committee of the

U.S. Senate, merely because it controls the purse strings, should put language in this bill which states that no funds of the Federal Government may be used to protect the Federal Government as a ratepayer in that case.

In my opinion, it is no answer to say that some other agency of the Federal Government can do it. In my judgment, it should be left up to the GSA, insofar as the present law is concerned, to make that determination, until the "adoption proceedings" the Senator from Rhode Island has recommended can be held.

I completely support the recommendation of the Senator from Rhode Island. Let us get on with this legislative business of ours, the business of letting the appropriate legislative committee—not the Appropriations Committee, because it is not a legislative committee—proceed to look into this matter in connection with all agencies, not only the GSA, but also all other Federal agencies. If there is a need, and if the taking of evidence will show there is a need, that this matter be subjected to some rules or regulations which are not now on the statute books, then let that legislative committee recommend them to the Senate.

But let us not buy a pig in a poke. Let us not accept this proposal of the Appropriations Committee when there cannot be submitted to us any body of hearings on this subject matter that has been held by a legislative committee of the Congress.

It is unpleasant to comment in criticism of the Appropriations Committee, but in my opinion the Appropriations Committee is wrong in this matter, both as to the procedure it has followed and in regard to the substance of this matter.

I think the chairman of the subcommittee should grasp the suggestion made by the Senator from Rhode Island and go on to hearings in the interim period between now and next January.

I just cannot follow the Senator from Washington in his argument that we have to do this in order to get into conference. I do not think we ought to get to conference with it. I do not think it is a matter on which to go to conference in this appropriation bill. The time to go to conference is when there is separate legislation. I think there ought to be separate legislative hearings on it which make recommendations as to what changes, if need be, ought to be made.

Because the GSA has been functioning well, I know there are groups in this country who would like to get this language in the bill, from the standpoint of their selfish interests. The private utilities would like to have this language. The only one in the Federal Power Commission who happened to be interested in this was Mr. Kuykendall. My attitude and my view as to what he has been doing in this field for years and years is on record.

I am not interested in putting in this bill language that is going to be welcomed with hurrahs by the private utilities because it denies representation to a major consumer. I stand up to de-



fend the GSA for the excellent record it has been making for 12 years. It has probably made some mistakes. If it is GSA policy Congress desires to control, what is proposed is not the proper way to accomplish that. We do not have a record of the justification for voting to take away from GSA further activities along this line.

The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. We ought to submit this question to a legislative committee between now and January 1, and let it be considered as a legislative matter.

I repeat, we would not have gotten into this trouble, in my judgment, if a different parliamentary ruling had been handed down from the desk. I think the Senator from Washington is mistaken in his position. We ought to accept the proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island, and then let the Senator from Washington appear before the committee, if he thinks he has evidence justifying the language he is proposing. Then let that committee pass on it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Oregon is a little ahead of the Senator from Washington. I have not said anything about the proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. MORSE. No; but the Senator from Washington has said plenty about the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, I have. I have tried to explain the position of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator did explain it, and I think the committee's position is dead wrong.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Oregon may think it is wrong. Some of the members of the committee did not think it was wrong. We are entitled to our own position. There was plenty of testimony in the committee on which the members of the committee could make up their minds. There are over 300 pages of it in the volume of the hearings.

I do not agree with the Senator from Oregon. He thinks the Appropriations Committee made a wrong decision. I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee, and this is what the committee decided.

Mr. MORSE. I much prefer the recommendation made by another member of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think we ought to respect the committee.

Mr. MORSE. I respect it and completely disagree with it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I often disagree. As a matter of fact, I could say something here, but I am not going to. [Laughter.]

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I have listened closely to the colloquy for the last several minutes. I came into this question with a completely open mind. I had thought to follow the committee's action. I do not think it is unfair to suggest that out of all this discussion one word has tended to dominate the exchange from all sides, and that word is "uncertainty." There

is uncertainty as to the scope of the duplication. There is uncertainty as to the legislative intent in this endeavor. Because of those two considerations, it seems to me the better part of wisdom is to accept the Proxmire amendment in this instance, to abide by the excellent suggestion so forcefully expressed by the able Senator from Rhode Island, and proceed along that line.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin would be willing to ask unanimous consent, without prejudice, to temporarily lay aside the amendment, so we can proceed with the consideration of the bill. Two or three Senators want to discuss the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, before the Senator makes that request, will the Senator yield to me so that I may associate myself with what has been said?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have spoken to the distinguished chairman of the committee about this particular language in the appropriation bill. I join in what the Senator from Oregon has said about the ruling on this language. There is a very fine line of difference between what would be legislation in the pending appropriation bill and what would be a limitation. This language has been interpreted by the Parliamentarian and the Chair to be merely a limitation upon this particular appropriation. Be that as it may, it has the effect of legislation. It seems to me what the Senator from Rhode Island has suggested is most appropriate and proper, since, for all practical purposes, this involves legislation, because it involves a fundamental change in policy, a policy which was set down in Congress years ago, in which the GSA was directed to represent the interests of the Federal Government in utility cases. It is proposed that that policy now, at least for 1 year, be changed by this limitation in the appropriation.

I think it goes without too much argument that if it is changed for 1 year in this bill, as the committee is suggesting, a precedent is set, first a precedent in appropriation bills of changing a basic statutory policy by a year-to-year paralysis, so to speak. It is not really killed; it is just anesthetized. It loses all form of motion.

I am hopeful that the chairman, when he consults with his worthy colleagues, will see fit to suggest, in his wise and judicious manner, that this whole matter go over; that the Proxmire amendment be accepted as necessary surgery, as political and legislative surgery upon this measure. The Senator from Washington is chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I gather the substantive legislative inquiry would come before his committee. There is nobody in this body who does not have the utmost confidence in the fairness and basic integrity of the Senator from Washington. We know the Senator will do the right thing.

I am hopeful, therefore, as I draw my argument to a close, that the Senator from Washington has already come to

the conclusion it would be wise to accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and take the problem back to the legislative committee, thereby not jeopardizing passage of the bill before the Senate by prolonging the argument over this particular time.

This is not a new problem, but has been before us a number of times. Powerful forces are at work which would like nothing better than to limit the capacity of the Federal Government to represent the public interest in rate cases.

I was involved in an argument 3 or 4 years ago in regard to this very same item, in respect to telephone rates. I suggest that the amount of money the Federal Government pays through the Department of Defense alone in telephone rates is worthy of some consideration by the appropriate agencies of Government and by the Congress.

One other item ought to be mentioned. There was a reduction in the total appropriations. There is not only a limitation upon the right of the GSA to make presentations, but there is an appropriation reduction of \$300,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is with respect to the full amount.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But it is still a reduction of \$300,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is interesting sometimes to note how there can be proposed the expenditure of vast sums of money to investigate into the causes of warts on corn stalks, though we cannot seem to find money to investigate why utility rates might be too high, or whether they are inequitable in terms of many areas of our country.

If the Senator from Washington has had time to cogitate in respect to the problem and to arrive at the mature and judicious decision I think he has reached, and is ready to accept the amendment, I shall be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Wisconsin has a request he wishes to make at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, in view of the suggestion and the request of the chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed to further consideration of the bill, with the understanding that the amendment will be taken up at a later time, with the remaining time available to proponents and opponents preserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire how much time remains on either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 3 minutes remaining and the Senator from Wisconsin has 44 minutes remaining.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?



Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Washington has 44 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 3 minutes remaining and the Senator from Wisconsin has 44 minutes remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I should like to make a further request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Wisconsin has said he would be glad to yield some of his time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know one or two Senators desire to speak. If the Senator from Wisconsin would be willing to yield 20 minutes of the 44 minutes he has remaining, that, added to the 3 minutes the Senator from Washington has, would make the time relatively even for debate; 23 minutes for one side and 24 minutes for the other side.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is perfectly all right. I think it is quite a sacrifice, but I am willing to make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, perhaps the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts could persuade those Senators who wish to address themselves to the question to do what some of us are now planning to do, which is to conserve some time on the question by abbreviating our remarks, making the sentiment clear and leaving the retails to be made a matter of record.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, in order to reply to my good friend from Wyoming, I do not think the speakers whom I have in mind are orators who speak at length. I make no comparisons, but I do not think they are orators who speak at length.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, is there objection to the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I know there is another amendment to be offered. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I understand that the Senator from Delaware has an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, beginning with "\$81,700,000" it is proposed to strike out all through the words "fiscal year" on line 11, and insert in lieu thereof "\$74,800,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, the amendment cuts \$6,900,000 from the bill, which money had been provided as a subsidy for the helicopter service in three cities—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. It was discussed last Saturday, and I think the chairman of the committee stated that he was in agreement with the principle that the subsidy for the three helicopter services should be curtailed next year. The purpose of the amendment is to stop the subsidy now. I think it is an indefensible subsidy. We are presently paying \$6,900,000 to subsidize helicopter service in these 3 cities. This figures out to be \$18,000 a day. Last year 490,000 passengers were transported by the 3 services, which means that the taxpayers paid a subsidy of \$15 per passenger for those using the helicopter service between the downtown areas of these three cities and the airports.

This is a new subsidy program now applicable to three cities. Thirty-five other cities have applications pending. The subsidy cost for the three cities is now \$6,900,000, and it will multiply many times when these other applications are approved.

The time to stop this is now before it is expanded further.

I think that those who buy tickets from those respective cities should pay their own fares and not expect the American taxpayers to pay part of them. The committee report is strong in its statement:

The committee is strongly of the opinion that the helicopter subsidy should be ended at the earliest opportunity.

Continuing, they point out that there are applications pending for 35 additional helicopter services to be certificated by the Department for other cities. If we are going to provide helicopter service for three cities, certainly there is a logical argument to supply similar services for other cities. If we are going to supply services for all cities it is hard to foresee the size of the subsidy that will be called for next year.

Before the proposed 30 to 35 additional services are authorized, I think we ought to stop the authorization of the subsidy in the present bill. We should strike it out and let the passengers involved pay their own fares.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the purpose of the subsidy?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The subsidy is to help helicopters reduce their charges, to transport passengers between airports and downtown New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Mr. CURTIS. Why?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know of no reason for it. I have therefore offered the amendment to strike out the appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the subsidy proposed because the particular service is in its infancy?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That could be used as one of the arguments, but if so it is an expensive infant.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think it would be a proper argument.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that the House took a similar position that the service should not be extended to other cities. But, after all, if subsidized helicopter service exists for 3 cities in the country all cities, including Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Kansas City, and so forth, will ask for similar service. In many of those cities there presently is a helicopter service, but it is being operated on a business-like basis. The passengers who use it pay for it. I think passengers using the service in these 3 cities should also pay for the service.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Delaware that the service is in no way of assistance for carrying the United States mail?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the service is used by the U.S. Postal Department, but that expense is paid not through the present appropriation bill but through the appropriation of the Post Office Department.

The report states that these 3 services hauled 490,000 passengers last year. If the service is used to transport mail I am sure that the Post Office Department is paying adequately for the service.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. I expect to support his amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I believe it is extremely unfortunate that, in this Congress, my friend from Delaware should offer the amendment. Let Senators clearly understand that the substantive law of this land provides that the Civil Aeronautics Board may provide for assistance to helicopter operations in the country and provide for it because the national interest warrants it. If Senators will refer to page 5 of the report, they will find specifically why certifications were given to the three helicopter services now in existence in the State of New York, in New York City, the State of Illinois, in Chicago, and in the State of California, in Los Angeles. The statement on page 5 is as follows:

The helicopter carriers were certificated for three specific purposes: (1) to expedite metropolitan mail deliveries to the central post office; (2) to assist in the development of rotary-wing aircraft for national defense purposes—

I underline that point for the benefit of my able friend from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] because the testimony was replete with convincing evidence that the operation now approved by the CAB has been of direct value to the military—and (3) to determine the feasibility of transportation of passengers, in addition to mail and property, between the centers of cities or their airports to suburban and outlying areas.

I make this point. These carriers, under the law, asked the Civil Aeronautics



Board for certification. After hearings, the CAB, following the law, determined they should be certified and, in accordance with the law, recommended the amount of the subsidy. The Budget Bureau concurs. To this the Senator from Delaware objects. I regret his objection. For we do here precisely what we did for a fledgling commercial air transport industry in the days gone by. The Senator objects to the amount. The Budget Bureau, because it followed the law, recommended the amount of the subsidy to Congress, with respect to the recommended appropriation. If you object to this program, I suggest that it would come with better grace if you offered an amendment to delete the substantive law on the subject.

If Senators will read the report at page 6 they will find this language:

The committee is strongly of the opinion that the helicopter subsidy should be ended at the earliest opportunity. It realizes that further development of the helicopter can be profitably entertained. It urges the Civil Aeronautics Board to maintain close supervision of this service and this development and be prepared to inform the committee fully in the next session as to how long it will take to put this service on a self-supporting basis and end the subsidies for helicopter development. The committee, at the same time, realizes that the U.S. mail service is assisted by this service and expects this use of the helicopter to be improved and expanded.

Before the committee, there appeared representatives of the helicopter services, all of whom testified that they are desirous now to utilize unique, new twin engine helicopters in their operations which, were they permitted to do so—and they will do so if this language in the bill is adopted—would bring them to the point where their operations could be self-sufficient.

I say to my able friend from Delaware that I think it is woefully regrettable that he should offer his amendment at this time, particularly when the committee is obviously concerned, as is my friend from Delaware, with the problem. The law being what it is, and the possibility of a breakthrough occurring this year, or next, or before too long, and, in addition, with the uncontroverted evidence of great assistance to the Military Establishment being what they are, for a unique type of use to which helicopters are put, it is regrettable that on this occasion he should offer the amendment. I urge him, therefore, to consider withdrawing it. Otherwise, his amendment ought to be defeated. The purpose of this item in this bill is a public purpose. Congress has already decided that. What these three operations are able to accomplish for the benefit of people in heavily populous areas will be of benefit to every city, to every metropolitan area in the land. Senators, I beg of you to defeat the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from California. I recognize that one can justify almost any expenditure which is being asked for on the floor of the Senate on the basis of its contribution to national defense. However, somewhere, we must draw the line. Let us remember that the request

for this subsidy was filed long before we ever thought of the present crisis in Berlin. It has nothing to do with defense. The elimination of the subsidy would not restrict the Post Office Department in making contractual arrangements for transporting mail between the post office and the airport. That is being paid for by the Post Office Department.

These subsidies asked for here are for the purpose of transporting passengers primarily between the airport and downtown sections of a city.

According to the committee report, for a full year of operation with 13 of the improved helicopters, the subsidies are estimated next year to total \$9 million for the 3 carriers. The bill before us provides \$6,900,000. The House originally provided \$5 million. If that is a trend toward reduction then I do not understand mathematics.

The Senator from Washington made an eloquent statement last Saturday in which he said he thought we should consider the elimination of this subsidy. I agree with the Senator. The point I make is that if we intend to stop the subsidy, it is easier to stop it this year when there are only 3 lines which have been certified by the CAB than it will be next year after 30 more lines will have been certified. Then there will be 30 representatives to speak in behalf of these carriers. If this subsidy is to be continued indefinitely then why are we kidding the taxpayers with talk about stopping it? It is not justified and should not be expanded.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I notice that the language cited with reference to the use of helicopters is for mail service, to expedite metropolitan mail delivery to central post offices. Mail deliveries are usually made in a day's time. A letter is mailed and it is expected to be delivered the next day. Perhaps in a few places it is measured in half days. If a letter is to be delivered in one of these cities, it is difficult for me to see how perhaps an hour's difference in time in transporting the mail from the airport to the central post office could change the delivery date. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree. Even if it did, the Post Office Department can negotiate contracts with these companies and is doing so. This does not restrict their payments. There are only three cities which are the beneficiaries of this helicopter service. If a person wishes to go to Friendship Airport, he can take a bus or use the limousine service from Washington. If he wants to go by helicopter he can pay for it. I would suggest that if he cannot afford to pay for the helicopter service to the airport he probably cannot afford the trip and had better stay at home. If it is necessary for the taxpayers to pay a subsidy of \$15 on his trip he ought to consider staying at home.

Why should the taxpayers be asked to subsidize the passengers using this helicopter service to the extent of \$18,-

000 per day, or \$15 per passenger? Why can they not pay their own fares?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course some persons cannot stay home, but must make a trip. The Senator from Washington said the other day he agreed with what the committee said. I did not say the subsidy should be ended. The committee said:

The committee is strongly of the opinion that the helicopter subsidy should be ended at the earliest opportunity.

The reason we said that was that about half of the testimony contained in this large volume was with respect to General Services and helicopters—that there was considerable testimony from outside experts to the effect that it looked as though we were going to make a breakthrough with new equipment and twin-engine helicopters. The committee states:

The new twin turbine-powered helicopters, carrying about 25 passengers, will have a seat-mile operating cost of 12 cents compared to 29 cents for the 15-or-less passenger reciprocating engine helicopters now in commercial use.

Therefore we thought because this provision is still in the law, and CAB thought that it should have an opportunity to carry through on this. These companies have on order now and are getting delivery now of the new helicopters. It was felt that there would be a great breakthrough, and that if we could continue with it we might extend helicopter services to other places, and operate it at a profit.

I will put in the RECORD later the figures. However, the helicopters do carry a great deal of mail. I believe the testimony was that they were paid \$2.58 per ton-mile on mail. All other carriers get \$2.80 or \$3.15. We suggest also that the Post Office Department pay what it is worth to haul mail in helicopters. That alone might take care of the subsidy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment does not at all affect mail payments. That subject is not affected at all by this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand. I was pointing out the situation as of now. The amount of \$1,900,000 was added by the committee as being the amount required by law. Perhaps we can change the law, but we put as strong language in the bill as the House did. There was ample testimony that it looked as though there was going to be a breakthrough and that this might be a very valuable matter for the United States and for the whole transport system. But we were of the opinion that it should be ended at the earliest opportunity, and that we would have some figures to show that there is a breakthrough. The figure of \$6,900,000 is not our figure; it is the figure of the CAB, which relates to the law and required subsidy.

If helicopters were discontinued tonight, they would have a right to go to the Court of Claims and get the \$6,900,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator from Washington on one point; namely, that we may be on the verge of a breakthrough—but what kind of a breakthrough? That is why I want to have my amendment adopted.



The Government is paying \$6,900,000 a year to these three helicopter services. There are applications pending for 35 more. If there is the breakthrough, these may be a breakdown. Let us stop this unwarranted subsidy before we get a breakthrough where it will be beyond control.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no evidence at all that this new equipment would reduce operating costs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We should eliminate the basis for a subsidy? I see no evidence that would indicate that the cost will get less. In fact, the indications are that it will be increased next year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not what they say; it is what everybody who knows and understands the aviation business says, including the CAB and those in charge here.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the Senator from Washington will, I feel certain, agree with me that if we added \$15 to the price of the ticket it would eliminate the necessity of any subsidy.

I come back to the question, If a person is going to use the service—and I think it is a wonderful service; I have used it myself—why should he not pay for it?

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield on the question as to why he should not pay for it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have never ridden in a helicopter. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have ridden in many of them. I should like to tell the Senator why what he is asking is impractical. If a passenger had to pay \$24 to go from Newark Airport to La Guardia or from La Guardia Airport to Newark Airport—today it costs \$9, which is a reasonable, economic charge—if the passenger were charged \$24, he would not use the service, and if he would not use it, we would lose the benefit of the present experiment.

I have just got off the plane, having returned from New York. I have seen the helicopters which connect all the airports take off and land.

We are experimenting with the public's participation in a very important field. We will solve the problem of the metropolitan areas within a hundred miles of the big cities, which is one of the grave problems affecting metropolitan areas today, through the use of the helicopter.

For example, New York cannot use the MacArthur Airport, which is 70 miles from New York, because it is too far away. There is no adequate helicopter service which can be reasonably carried on on an economic basis because the cost with present planes is prohibitive. The present helicopters have too low a capacity.

This whole operation is in a completely experimental stage. It offers incalculable benefits to the whole Nation, in terms of assisting heavily populated areas which are just outside metropolitan areas, by tying the metropolitan areas together with a view to the national defense.

The military authorities—and I am a Reserve officer, and I am aware of this—tell us that this is the kind of help they need.

I can say that it is simply uneconomical to charge what it costs. It is very wise for the United States to help this development for a time, until it secures a breakthrough.

I am glad there are 35 applications. I wish there were 350.

The Senator from Delaware, whom I love and admire, should realize that the United States is not only what it spends and what it owes, but what it is worth and what it makes. Certainly the United States has a national debt of \$295 billion, but it has a gross national production of \$500 billion. This country is worth not less than a trillion dollars.

When the United States had a gross national debt of \$100 billion, it was a less good credit risk because it did not have as much and was not earning as much. The question is not that we should not spend; the question is that we should spend wisely, for good purposes, purposes which are constructive. That is what this country is about.

I do not want the President of a corporation not to spend; he will go broke tomorrow. What can he do with assets? It is earnings that counts.

That is what we are talking about here. We are talking about making our country richer, more productive, more economical.

I think it would be very shortsighted if this amendment were to be agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For years and years, the entire air industry simply could not get on its feet, until it developed the DC-3. It was only after it reduced costs by 10 percent that the airplane industry could see the light. From that time on, it has gone steadily forward, to operate on a self-sufficient basis.

With the new twin-prop helicopters that it is proposed to buy—some of which are presently on order—it is expected that the costs per passenger-mile will probably be reduced by 51 percent. They will have the advantage of all the pioneering that goes into the unit—structure and design. Give them a little time, and these companies will be on their feet. The operation will become self-sufficient in almost every metropolitan center in the Nation.

We have a problem today. A whole fleet of planes go into the municipal airport in South Chicago; others go into International Airport, in the northwest section. It is a fact that the helicopter service which now operates between the airports and over to Gary, Ind., and elsewhere, that enables them to conduct the whole operation satisfactorily, so that ultimately they will get to the point where they will be on a self-sustaining basis.

For that reason, I trust that the funds involved here will not be reduced or that they will not be deleted.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois. I have used that

very service from O'Hara to Meigs. I have found it extremely useful. I would be perfectly willing to use it again.

As a matter of fact, there was a very serious accident with a helicopter in Chicago recently, but it involved the use of an older type craft than one of the present models.

I have not been in this debate until a few minutes ago, so I should like to ask, Has any charge been made that an unconscionable profit is made by the helicopter companies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. This is a part of the RECORD, I believe. The financial statements of the companies show that although they have been in the business for years—this is a special branch of the aviation industry—that many of them could do better if they operated as regular airlines than as shuttle lines. However, the helicopter operators are experienced people. They are very enthusiastic about its possibilities. I do not believe they are performing this service merely to impress us. The fact is that they see a chance for a breakthrough and lower operational costs. I think that was the motivating factor, as is borne out by the testimony of the experts.

Mr. JAVITS. So the Senator from Washington does not believe there is any likelihood that the helicopter operators see a chance to make an unconscionable profit?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. The financial statements of all three companies are in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. I was interested also in the screening of the committee and its staff. I gather from that that the screening committee found no reason to believe that there was any sluicing off.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; we have read the financial statements. They are there for Senators to see.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Government now has \$38 million invested in this enterprise. I do not believe we should stop two-thirds of the way to the goal. That is an additional reason, I think, for maintaining this item in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope we will assist this big improvement, which everyone believes in.

There are about 10 or 12 other places throughout the country where this kind of service could be used, or at least tried out, to see whether it might be put into effect. My own section of the country lends itself to such operations, as does the San Francisco area, where there are large bodies of water, and where it would take hours to travel around them. It might take 7 hours to drive around Puget Sound, in order to travel from an airport, whereas to travel by helicopter might take 15 or 20 minutes.

The same is true of the San Francisco Bay area.

I have been considering the possibilities of this service for a long time. I think that the cities, in order to solve their urban transportation problem, will have to return to mass transportation. The increasing use of automobiles will simply clutter up the surface transportation more and more.



Helicopter service will help to relieve that situation. The Senator from California, who understands the situation in Los Angeles, knows that the traffic problem is becoming worse and worse every day.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Washington is completely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A person who might have to travel 25, 40, or 50 miles from an airport would have to spend 4 or 5 hours to travel that distance, but he could cover that distance in a very short time by helicopter service.

I hope the experiment will prove to be satisfactory and that the additional service will prove beneficial, because it is an integral part of the transportation system.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the chairman of the committee for his awareness of the situation.

I speak from personal experience, as representing the largest metropolitan area in the country. I really feel, with all deference, that of the many important things, in the bill, aside from those which are related to the national security, this is one of the most critical. I hope very much that the Senate will not strike it out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from New York and other Senators, but I repeat what I said before. I am not objecting to the helicopter service. I think it is an excellent service. But when the Senator from New York or the Senator from Delaware or any other Senator uses it, he should pay for his own transportation and should not ask the Federal Government to pay a part by providing a subsidy.

As to the point that this will be a breakthrough, certainly it will, but in which direction; at this rate the next time it will be a multi-million-dollar item in the bill. Only three helicopter services are provided for now, but this is only the beginning. Already applications have been received for such helicopter service in 35 other cities. If all of those are approved, it is hard to estimate what the cost will be next year.

It is said that there will soon be a reduction in the cost of this service. In that connection, I point out that for the fiscal year 1961, only recently past, the subsidy for the Chicago Helicopter Airways was \$1,433,381; the subsidy for the Los Angeles Airways was \$982,948; and the subsidy for the New York Airways was \$2,109,933—or a total of \$4,526,262 for these three helicopter services in the fiscal year 1961. But the CAB estimate for the same services, by only these three helicopter services, for the fiscal year 1962 is \$6,900,000, or an increase of \$2,400,000. The committee states that progress is being made and that the cost of this service will be reduced and the subsidy will be cut down. However, it is important to note that in this bill the "saving" is made and the item "cut down" by increasing it from \$4,526,262 to \$6,900,000. In other words, the committee would have us "save" so much that we would have to add \$2,400,000 for this item this year.

Madam President, what does the committee say it expects this item to be for these same three cities in the next year? The committee's best estimate is that the next year for the helicopter service for only these three cities will be \$9.1 million, another 50-percent increase. Certainly if we continue to "save" money each year by increasing the expenditures or the cost 50 percent each year we shall "save" ourselves into bankruptcy. Let us stop kidding the taxpayers. This subsidy cost is and will continue to be higher each year unless stopped now.

If the Congress wishes to start to underwrite this new subsidy let it go on record officially in that way, then if next year the subsidy is to be expanded very greatly by granting the requests for such service to the other cities we will know who is responsible. If this is to be a \$50-million or \$100-million subsidy in later years for these services then let us not kid the taxpayers by saying that we did not know what we were doing this year. Instead, let us recognize it; either we stop it now for these three cities, or else we will be asked to authorize the extension to all the other cities which wish to have this same service.

Madam President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I renew my request that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and that Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 115]

YEAS—26

|               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson      | Fulbright    | Proxmire       |
| Bennett       | Goldwater    | Russell        |
| Boggs         | Hickenlooper | Smathers       |
| Byrd, Va.     | Lausche      | Symington      |
| Case, S. Dak. | Long, Mo.    | Talmadge       |
| Church        | Miller       | Thurmond       |
| Cotton        | Morse        | Tower          |
| Curtis        | Morton       | Williams, Del. |
| Dworshak      | Mundt        |                |

NAYS—63

|              |              |                |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Aiken        | Gruening     | Metcalfe       |
| Bartlett     | Hart         | Monroney       |
| Beall        | Hartke       | Moss           |
| Bible        | Hayden       | Muskie         |
| Bridges      | Hickey       | Neuberger      |
| Bush         | Hill         | Pastore        |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Holland      | Pell           |
| Cannon       | Humphrey     | Prouty         |
| Capehart     | Jackson      | Randolph       |
| Carlson      | Javits       | Robertson      |
| Carroll      | Johnston     | Saltonstall    |
| Case, N.J.   | Jordan       | Schoeppel      |
| Clark        | Keating      | Scott          |
| Dirksen      | Kuchel       | Smith, Mass.   |
| Dodd         | Long, Hawaii | Smith, Maine   |
| Douglas      | Long, La.    | Sparkman       |
| Eastland     | Magnuson     | Stennis        |
| Ellender     | Mansfield    | Wiley          |
| Engle        | McClellan    | Williams, N.J. |
| Ervin        | McGee        | Young, N. Dak. |
| Fong         | McNamara     | Young, Ohio    |

NOT VOTING—11

|         |          |            |
|---------|----------|------------|
| Allott  | Cooper   | Kerr       |
| Burdick | Gore     | McCarthy   |
| Butler  | Hruska   | Yarborough |
| Chavez  | Kefauver |            |

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.



Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is my understanding correct that my amendment with respect to the GSA was temporarily laid aside while the other amendment was disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is my understanding correct that my amendment is now the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, if the Senator wishes to call up his amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I call up my amendment, and I ask the Presiding Officer to state how much time remains on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the final agreement, the Senator from Wisconsin has 24 minutes remaining and the opposition has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Missouri has a very brief statement he wishes to make of 3 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for 3 minutes, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### NUCLEAR TEST RESUMPTION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, when unilateral test cessation was first brought up in 1956, the premise was that any violation could be detected.

In 1958 this premise was changed to the opinion that any test below 5 kilotons might not be detected—at that time effort was made to show that such low yield tests would be of negligible importance.

In 1959 this premise was changed to the opinion that any test below 20 kilotons might not be detected.

In 1960 the premise was that any test below 100 kilotons might not be detected—that year there was talk that any test below 500 kilotons might not be detected.

In 1961, as a result of answers Mr. McCloy supplied to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in response to a request of "how" a nuclear test cessation agreement would function, the premise is that now the Soviets might conduct a megaton test without detection.

In the beginning we talked about the great danger of atomic testing—strontium 90, carbon 14, and so forth—but such dangers do not apply to underground testing, which is what we are talking about now; and yet this is not clear to the people.

Why should we continue to consider logical an argument based on a now obviously false premise?

Madam President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from

the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, of July 28, "No More Test Hedging."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NO MORE TEST HEDGING

Some of the Nation's leading scientists, a whole panel of them, flatly informed the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy Wednesday that Soviets could test nuclear weapons in a number of Asia's sectors with almost no possibility the West could detect them.

Further, the committee was told that, as detection techniques improve, paradoxically it will be still harder to distinguish a nuclear blast from an earthquake.

In other words, Communists can have been testing throughout the test-ban agreement of almost 3 years, and no one in America or anywhere also in the West could know. This has long been the warning of highly placed nuclear experts. And possibility of scientific detection will get worse in the future.

The ban on testing will probably prove to have been a unilateral stifling of Western nuclear advance from the very beginning. It has been a tragic stupidity, crippling U.S. defense.

Now Congress has got the best available information. So has the White House.

What are we waiting for? Fear of marring the "Western image" by dumping the no-test agreement? That image must be the midcentury's biggest joke in the Kremlin. It could prove a Red hoax next only to the Russian promise of free elections for its satellites.

U.S. underground testing of atomic and nuclear implements of war and peace should be resumed at once.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, note the sentence:

In other words, Communists can have been testing throughout the test-ban agreement of almost 3 years—and no one in America or anywhere in the West could know.

I have done my best to understand this subject, and I believe that sentence is accurate.

Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent to have an editorial, "Why Wait," from the Washington Sunday Star of July 30, inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHY WAIT?

In effect, in their latest testimony before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, some of our most distinguished scientists have merely confirmed the committee's 1960 conclusions of the subject. Accordingly, as summed up at that time by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, head of the Senate-House group, the conclusions are worth repeating:

"It appears from the testimony that for the next several years at least it will not be possible to detect and identify underground bomb tests whose seismic signals record the equivalent of nonmuffled bomb explosions of 20 kilotons or less.

"Further, it appears that for this same time period, it will not be possible to detect muffled tests of 100 kilotons or more [upward, that is, of 100 thousand tons of exploding TNT] set off deep underground in large cavities."

As a matter of fact, in their latest appearance before the committee, the scientists have been altogether pessimistic as regards developing a reliable detecting system. That

is to say, they have bluntly asserted that there is little or no possibility at present of working out trustworthy ways and means of safeguarding against clandestine underground or outer-space nuclear shots. Actually, as of this very moment, the Kremlin could be carrying out such potentially decisive experiments without our having the slightest awareness of them.

These experiments could be of revolutionary significance. They could have to do with the so-called neutron or death-ray bomb, and they could have to do, also, with antimissile missiles capable of destroying or "neutralizing" any rockets incoming from the enemy's launching pads. Certainly, considering the clear record of Soviet furtiveness and broken promises, they are experiments that the Kremlin could have been carrying out surreptitiously almost from the very day, nearly 3 years ago, that our country unwisely agreed to declare a moratorium on testing while seeking to work out an adequately policed ban on the whole business. Clearly, these possible clandestine shots by the Russians could give them a significant military advantage over us.

All this, it seems to us, adds up to a fairly simple conclusion: The United States, even as it carries out the new defensive measures proclaimed by the President, should resume underground nuclear testing without further delay. Mr. Kennedy appears to be hesitant on the matter. But why? Why should our country wait any longer before resuming the kind of detonations that the Russians may have been staging clandestinely, off and on, for the past 3 years?

In sum, given the utterly bleak record of the Kremlin's innumerable broken pledges, why should any American continue to accept an unpoliced ban on nuclear tests? The time has come for our Government, regardless of what might be the reaction of world opinion, to resume underground experimental shots, and the sooner the better. Our very survival as a Nation may well depend upon it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, this editorial has to do with the possibility of the neutron bomb and the antimissile missile being the result of testing over recent years.

One of the foremost authorities in this field told me recently the weapon he believes the Soviets will shortly display as a result of their tremendous advantage in thrust will be an armed satellite. If they have been testing, that testing of course could help them perfect such a system.

Based on the above facts, this editorial says:

In sum, given the utterly bleak record of the Kremlin's innumerable broken pledges, why should any American continue to accept an unpoliced ban on nuclear tests?

I ask the same question of the Senate this afternoon.

I thank my able colleague from Wisconsin for his courtesy in yielding.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 120) to authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, and for other purposes.



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to restore the \$300,000 appropriation for the General Services Administration for the preparation and presentation of evidence and arguments on behalf of the Government before Federal and State regulatory agencies. The amendment also strikes the restrictive language contained in H.R. 7445, as amended by the Appropriations Committee.

Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the General Services Administration is charged with the responsibility of representing the executive agencies "in negotiations with carriers and other public utilities, and in proceedings involving carriers and other public utilities before Federal and State regulatory bodies." The bill, as reported by the Appropriations Committee, would repeal, in effect, this section of the act.

The Appropriations bill not only removes funds necessary to prepare and present material to the regulatory agencies, it would prohibit the General Services Administration from preparing or presenting evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation of utility companies.

The effect of this section of the bill, as reported by the Committee, would be to deny General Services Administration the authority or facilities to participate in rate cases. If GSA cannot discuss rates or evaluations, there would be no meaningful evidence or arguments. Such a restriction would make a mockery of General Services Administration participation in such cases. It would have the effect of denying to the Government its right to protect itself in ratemaking cases.

The Government is a major consumer in the public utility field. In fact, it is the biggest consumer in the United States. I cannot favor legislation which would tie the hands of the Government in protecting its own interests and would force the taxpayer to pay more for Government service than he should.

I believe that the record of the General Services Administration, in saving taxpayers an estimated \$160 million in 10 years in ratemaking cases, has amply demonstrated the value of its work in this area. A \$300,000 annual investment is a fair cost on a \$16 million return.

We have established regulatory agencies to adjudicate, among other things, public utility rate disputes. These agen-

cies have been created to perform quasi-judicial functions. We do not establish them to represent one side or the other in regulatory cases.

The Government has a legitimate interest in the outcome of ratemaking cases. It would not be proper, however, to rely on the regulatory agencies to represent the Government in such cases. Such an action would destroy the integrity of the regulatory agencies. General Services Administration represents the logical facility for presenting the case on behalf of the taxpayers. I urge that we reject the attempt to remove that protection and pass the Proxmire amendment.

In the course of the debate some questions have been raised as to the position of State regulatory agencies with respect to the provision of law which we are discussing in the Proxmire amendment. I have some documentation on this score which I think ought to be made a part of the RECORD of this debate.

In November 1960 the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners convening in Las Vegas adopted a resolution entitled "Resolution Concerning the Unrestricted Intervention of the General Services Administration in the Jurisdiction of State and Federal Regulatory Commissions."

That resolution in effect would support the provision in H.R. 7445, which the Proxmire amendment would strike out. I think it is interesting to note that the resolution was proposed by several State regulatory agencies.

I should like to refer to an article which was published in the December 10, 1960, issue of "Traffic World." I read from that publication:

When Commissioner Peter E. Mitchell, of the California Public Utilities Commission (newly elected president of NARUC) as chairman of the executive committee, had finished reading the amended resolution on the GSA, he announced that he wished the record to show that he did not approve of it. He was joined in this disapproval by other State commissioners, including his fellow Californian, Commissioner Theodore H. Jenner; Commissioner Richard J. McMahon, of the Maine Public Utilities Commission, and Commissioner Ralph L. Fusco, president of the New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners.

The article comments on the action before the national association, as follows:

Commissioner McMahon, in support of the GSA and in opposition to the resolution, said the Federal agency had been helpful in certain water cases in Maine and that it had furnished the State commission technical information for the production of which the State did not have the necessary experts. He said the State preferred one central service representing the U.S. Government in proceedings.

Commissioner Jenner, in a vigorous presentation, said California opposed adoption of the GSA resolution and that its adoption would embarrass the Federal agency. In the west coast State, he said, the commission had permitted GSA appearances in many proceedings. It was the State commission's policy, he said, to recognize anyone who had a presentation to make, and the commission did not want to curb this right.

"Regulation in the United States," he declared, "is in its infancy and is a typical

American institution based on private enterprise. If regulation does not work—

I emphasize that point—

it is one more step toward socialism. Regulation will not work unless we recognize this right of parties to appear before us."

I have further documentation on this question in the form of a letter from Commissioner Richard J. McMahon of the Maine Public Utilities Commission, which letter is dated April 7, 1961. In commenting on the resolutions to which I have been referring he said:

Why should a national association such as NARUC say that the agency representing the largest customer (GSA representing the Federal Government) of most utilities be restricted in their appearances and the type of evidence that they can submit before regulatory commissions?

Mr. McMahon offers the following answer to the question. He said:

This is basically a fight between American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Federal Government. In most regulatory Commissions the Commission policy is that anybody who has any complaints or evidence to offer is given his day and allowed to enter his appearance and have his say in opposition to any utility. In Maine we have listened to testimony by the hour from individuals who have had very little to offer in real substantial evidence but they have always been given their day in court before us. I don't think that any customer of any utility should be restricted in the type of evidence they wish to present and certainly it has been my experience that the Federal Government through GSA has never abused their right to appear.

GSA has appeared in Maine and helped the Maine commission with its preparation of evidence in the Bangor water case. We have worked with them in Presque Isle on water problems and they appeared on behalf of the Navy in the problems affecting the Brunswick Water District. In the last 2 years they have presented evidence in regard to the Air Force problems with American Telephone & Telegraph Co. on the rates affecting SAGE here in Maine.

I think it would be of interest for the purpose of the RECORD to have printed at this point Commissioner McMahon's account of what happened at the meeting of National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners when the resolution was adopted in November of 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. He said:

When this resolution was adopted, there was only a voice vote. When the vote was taken there were several individuals standing, asking for a call of the States by roll-call and by commission, but the president announced the results before he would recognize anybody on the floor. What he did—he allowed a motion to reconsider, but that was voted down by voice vote, and he announced that result and moved on to the next resolution before anything could be done to determine what States and commissions were in favor of the adoption of this resolution. In the room at the time were possibly 100 commissioners representing most of the States and Federal Commissions. Also, another 200 guests of the convention representing the affected industries



of all the resolutions passed at that session were present.

It seems to me that this is important documentation as we consider the important issue before the Senate. I hope the Senate will support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I have heard from the chairman of the Public Utility Commission of Colorado. He reaffirms in detail what the able Senator from Maine has said. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind what happened when the NARUC passed the resolution against the GSA. There was strong opposition to the NARUC resolution in its convention. The Colorado commission is on record as having opposed the NARUC position.

This is not a large amount the administration has asked for to fight for fair utility rates. How much is it? \$300,000?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, may I have an additional minute?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 1 more minute.

Mr. CARROLL. Three hundred thousand dollars. This is an important agency representing the Government as a consumer and therefore the taxpayers of the United States. How would GSA use the money? It would use it to prepare briefs, to intervene in rate cases with arguments on the fairness of proposed rates. I should think Senators would want to save the taxpayers some money. This is an economy measure. What we will be doing by supporting this amendment will be to save money for the Government as a utility consumer and it is therefore in the interest of the taxpayers.

The Government spends \$3 billion a year in utility payments. This is taxpayers' money. If \$300,000 in GSA legal services can trim millions out of that \$3 billion it is money well spent.

I cannot understand how any reasonable person dedicated to economy could object to the Proxmire amendment. I do not mean to cast any reflection on any Senator. We are entitled to our own motives. However I do not see how it could be misunderstood. This is a measure that will help assure the Government of fair utility rates. It is in the public interest.

I commend the able Senator from Maine for calling to the attention of the Senate the wide division of opinion within the NARUC.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield me some time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the opposition time has now arrived.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. This is an unusual Proxmire amendment. The amendments which he has previously offered were all intended to reduce sums in the bill. Now he gets into the other category, of in-

creasing funds. He adopts a new formula, a new outlook on life with respect to the pending amendment. The logic of this limitation is so clear that I am surprised to find it the subject of controversy. The subcommittee under the distinguished Senator from Washington and the full committee looked into this matter with great care. No one questions the right and the duty of GSA to obtain the most favorable utility rates possible for the U.S. Government. But the Government is the only consumer in which the GSA has a legitimate interest. The language of this limitation is intended only to confine GSA to its legitimate interest.

Such a limitation should not be necessary, but as we all know Government agencies are manned by bureaucrats who seek constantly to expand their authority and their power. Whenever we find a bureaucrat who is not attempting to do that, we certainly find a most unusual person.

There are, in addition, I fear those who become causists and wish to go beyond the scope of their authority to fight a cause. I very much suspect that such is the case in this instance.

It was an inadvertence that the committee's language should have been subject to interpretation which would have legislated the Federal Power Commission and other commissions in this bill out of the regulatory business. This situation has been cleared up by the adoption of an amendment to the committee language. The bill now expresses the original intent of the committee. It seems only reasonable to me that GSA, in protecting the legitimate interests of the Government should not duplicate the work of both Federal and State regulatory agencies. That is all this language provides and all it is intended to provide.

Those who believe that the Federal and State regulatory agencies are not performing their duties in a satisfactory way and should be, in effect, subject to GSA intervention and supervision—should, of course, vote for the Proxmire amendment. I cannot accept this position. Before I came to the U.S. Senate, I was a member of the public service commission of New Hampshire. I have never lost interest in this field. I can assure you, Mr. President, that by and large both the State and Federal regulatory agencies are performing their functions in a satisfactory manner.

If the Senate should adopt the pending amendment, we should logically proceed to strike out of this bill funds for the FPC, the ICC, the CAB, the FAA, the FCC, the FTC, and the SEC—which are regulatory agencies—and turn their functions over to GSA.

In my judgment, American business, which is the goose which lays the golden tax egg, is harrassed enough by Government forms and controls. This language is merely a small effort to prevent additional harassment by an agency which asserts a right to intervene in matters which are satisfactorily handled by other agencies. I hope the Senate will support the committee's intent and reject this amendment.

Madam President, in concluding I would like to say a few words about the

function of the Appropriations Committee. I served on that committee a good many years. As a member I can tell you we claim no right to legislate. Legislation is clearly the function of the legislative committees.

But the Appropriations Committee does have a right—no, a duty—to look into the authorized functions of each department and agency and to decide when they go overboard.

The funds which the committee has provided here for GSA are ample to discharge its legitimate authorized functions. The committee has simply decided it need not extend these functions beyond its legitimate interest—and this is the business of the Appropriations Committee.

Once we accept the premise that only the agency has a right to decide how far it may pursue its authorized functions we will find ourselves in really serious trouble and the Appropriations Committee may as well close up shop.

I can think of numerous authorized functions which agencies want to continually expand. It is the business of the Appropriations Committee to think of the taxpayer—who also happens to be a consumer—and this is precisely what was done in this instance.

I hope the Proxmire amendment will be defeated decisively.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall not take 10 minutes. I have been sitting on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices for more than 10 years, I believe. At one time I was the chairman of that subcommittee. We have had this question come before us ever since 1954, I believe, and it has been the subject of a continuing argument. It is the question of whether GSA shall go into the whole question of public utility rates in State and interstate commerce cases or whether it will act as an attorney, we might say, or as a proponent of the costs that the Government is paying for its share of the utilities. The Government in a great many instances gets special rates. It has the responsibility to see to it that those rates are fair so far as they concern the Government as a user. However, in testifying before the committee the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Aviation Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board have stated that they had ample authority and ample personnel to go into the question of whether the rates being charged as a whole by the utilities and by the various services are fair and proper to the public as a whole.

As I say, those are the agencies which are created by the Federal Government; and in every State, so far as I know, there is an agency such as a public utilities commission to determine whether the rates are fair.

I sincerely believe that GSA should examine into the question, when the Federal Government gets the bill for telephone services in my State of Massachusetts, to determine whether the bill for the Federal Government was fair; whether it represented the proper



amount for the Federal Government to pay for telephone service in Massachusetts.

But the question as to whether the overall rates are proper, based on the capital invested in the property the telephone company is using, for example, is a matter for the Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission; or if it is interstate, then it is a question for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will not be agreed to. I sat through the hearings on this subject. We agreed, after considerable discussion, that we would eliminate \$300,000 from the appropriation, and that we would put in this controlling amendment indicating what the money should be spent for.

We agreed that probably there would be a discussion in conference, and that if our language went too far or was not correct, we could work it out in conference. We could also put back the money in conference, if it were necessary to do so.

But the effort of the subcommittee was an attempt to bring the problem to a head; to try to decide it and get rid of it, and not have it come before us year after year.

The problem is whether the GSA should go further than to act as a bill collector, or a bill approver, for the service which the Federal Government was getting for the use of telephones or for the use of the other utilities which are represented by the five agencies—the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Communications Commission.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted, and that we may take the matter to conference. If it is not right, we can yield in conference. But certainly we ought not to yield now, because if we do, there will be nothing on which to go to conference. I am confident that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the subcommittee will then confront the Senate with the same problem agains next year.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will yield, if the Senator from Washington will yield time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand the language of the committee has been amended to limit the application of the limiting paragraph to the General Services Administration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under this heading, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] offered an amendment providing—

No part of the funds appropriated by the preceding paragraph of this Act—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Previously it simply read "funds appropriated by this Act."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not believe that even the original language would have applied to the Renegotiation Board, but there might be some question involved, if it ever applied to the Renegotiation Board. So I think it important that the Schoepfel perfecting amendment was adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator, as I agreed with the Senator from Kansas when he spoke to me about it.

I have nothing more to say about the amendment. I hope it will be rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD statements concerning this subject from the Federal departments, the FTC, the FPC, the ICC, and other agencies. The statements are pretty well summed up by Mr. Minow, who says:

We are very proud of our staff and we think it is very able. We would hope it would be supplemented pursuant to our request today. But we think it is competent to do the job.

GSA comes in, as I understand it—because this was before my arrival—to represent the point of view of the Government as a user. The Government is the largest phone user now in the United States. And when they do appear they take the view that they are representing the Government as a consumer of phone service. But we feel that our own staff is very able to represent the public as a whole.

The Federal Power Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other agencies testified in basically the same way with relation to the problem confronting Federal agencies. I ask unanimous consent that I may place those statements in the RECORD.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Assuming that the statement of Mr. Minow is correct with regard to his agency—

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Conceding that it is correct, is it not a fact that so far as State agencies are concerned, the Federal staff offers no assistance and can in no way participate so as to insure that the public interest will be protected?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Federal Staff in State cases?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The Federal staff, according to Mr. Minow, is efficient and can protect the public interest; but the Federal staff has no authority to go before a State commission and present the cause of the Federal Government on rates which will very vitally affect the Federal Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the GSA does that in every case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But if the bill is passed, they will no longer be able to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no, no, no, no. If the Senator will read the report, the language is directive. The GSA will appear to protect the Government as a user. There is absolutely no limitation upon that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us see:

No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the preparation or

presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and State regulatory agencies concerning regulatory policies of such agencies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On two things.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the overall earnings level and total property evaluation. Those two things are the vital things. If the GSA cannot appear on those things—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not wish to argue with the Senator from Ohio. That is the question we have been discussing all day. They can still appear on behalf of the Government as a user. No one objects to their doing that, not even those who are among the proponents of the language.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that statement, I agree. But the GSA cannot offer evidence on capital structure or on the reasonableness of the rate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Total property evaluation and overall earnings level. In other words, as I understand the problem, in some cases where there might be an intrastate rate suggested in the State of Washington, the State public utility commission can determine the valuation of the property in Washington through these very factors.

The GSA could enter the picture and say, "This proposal affects the Federal Government in a particular way. We do not wish to be discriminated against, so we appear in behalf of the Federal Government." It would enter the case on behalf of the Federal Government just as would the representative of any other user. I think the report answers that point.

I still stick to what we have said. This is the same type of language that has been in similar bills year after year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But it is correct to say that under this provision GSA will be prohibited from appearing before a State commission and there presenting evidence on capital structure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Oh, yes. I have studied the language. It provides that they shall not appear before a State agency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am no expert on this question. The language reads "overall earnings." The Senator from Ohio may know more about the interpretation of that than I do, but the testimony on those two items referred to overall earnings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the total property valuation. Those are the vital things; they are the very heart and core of the hearing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some persons say they are; some say they are not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Something more is involved in this item than consumer interest. I believe that involved here is the Federal-State system and the respect of each for the sovereignty of the other. States have the sovereign right to establish commissions to determine utility rates. The Federal Government likewise has that right. Virtually every



State has established a commerce commission or a utility commission which proceeds upon a certain base for the purpose of ratemaking. It may be the reproduction value; it may be the original cost; it may be a modification of the two. There are variations of the formulas which are used.

The State commissions are established under State authority for the purpose of determining a policy of valuation and also the earnings level as a rate base.

The amendment simply provides that no part of the funds shall be appropriated for the presentation of evidence, and so forth, concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on an overall earnings level or for total property valuation on transportation in public utilities. That is a State power.

All the cases which came before the committee, and all the testimony over a long period of time when I was on the subcommittee and this question was raised, always related to the case of Federal intrusion upon a basic authority and a basic right which the State has, and that transcends by far the consumer interest.

I remember that when Mr. Floete was the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and when this was only an infant function, we fought out this thing; and I remember the testimony which was submitted at that time by the various State agencies. I thought their objection to intrusion by the GSA, insofar as it went to the policies the State agencies applied in matters of evaluation and earnings level, was perfectly sound. And I think the language contained in this part of the bill today is sound.

There was a case right here in Washington, D.C., in which the Gas Light Co. was involved. The experts for the District of Columbia Commission found that one policy would produce a fair return. The GSA preferred still another one; and still a third one was found, finally, by the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission.

But the intrusion by the GSA on the policy followed by a State commission impinges, in my judgment, on the exclusive sovereignty the State has in such matters; and that is a place where the Federal Government should not intrude.

That is the reason why this language should be retained in the bill, and that is the reason why the Proxmire amendment should be rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Am I correct in saying that the interdiction is against presenting evidence or arguments in regard to the policies, rather than against the accuracy of the charges?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct; it deals purely with the regulatory policies followed by the State commissions. They are none of our business.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether he is sure that nothing in this paragraph, as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, would handicap the Government in attempting to recover for an overcharge.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know about that, as applied to this language; I do not know whether it is involved here at all.

Mr. AIKEN. But that is important.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But this is wholly a policy matter—namely, whether the GSA can go to Illinois or to Ohio and can say, in fact, to the public utility commission there, "We are going to argue the point that your approach is wrong. You proceed on a reproduction-cost basis, and we think that is wrong. If you will proceed on a cost basis, you will come up with a different rate of return." If that is not unwarranted Federal intrusion, then I never have seen any.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to the question asked by the Senator from Vermont, I would say it certainly would not prevent recovery by the Federal Government. That would be just the purpose of having the GSA appear there. If too much were charged the Federal Government for that service, the GSA would be absolutely within its province in trying to get that money returned to the Federal Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Absolutely so, when the GSA appears there and makes a specific charge that the Federal Government has been overcharged.

But the purpose of asking for all these millions of dollars and for a large staff is simply to be able to go before a State commission and to say to it, "Your base is wrong." But that is not for the Federal Government to determine.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be an attempt to influence the policy of the State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly it would.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me ask whether the Senator from Illinois takes the position that under this language in the appropriation bill, the General Services Administration will still have the right to appear before a commission and submit evidence on capital evaluation and submit evidence on earnings, but will not be allowed to argue the wisdom of the State policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So does the Senator from Illinois claim that if there is in Ohio an interstate question which in-

volves a utility service purchased at considerable expense by the Federal Government, the General Services Administration will be allowed to go to Ohio, present evidence in regard to what it thinks is the capital structure of the corporation, present evidence in regard to the earnings, and argue and submit briefs in regard to what it thinks the rate ought to be?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Nothing in this part of the bill would prevent the GSA from going to the capital city of Ohio and presenting there evidence to the effect that the Federal Government has been overcharged because the calculations were wrong, the arithmetic was wrong, and there were faulty evaluations of one kind or another.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But now the Senator from Illinois and I are not talking about the same thing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes, we are.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is precisely it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But when we get into the field of a policy established by the Ohio commission, that is where the General Services Administration is expected to stop, and not to undertake to impeach what the Ohio commission says and lays down as a principle of ratemaking. That is what this provision of the bill is designed to prevent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Illinois and I generally think about this matter on the same basis, but here is where we differ. If it is expected that the GSA will do that, why has \$300,000 been taken away from it—the principal means by which it can perform that duty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether that is the case or not. But I know what this language of the bill does; and when the GSA representatives and other witnesses appeared before the committee some years ago, when I was a member of it, I knew precisely what they meant when they said the Federal agency had no business sticking its nose into the policies pursued by the Virginia commission and by other State commissions. And that is precisely correct, because when that is done, the sovereignty of the State systems is destroyed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President—

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I wish to make clear that the Senator from Iowa is speaking in time that I have yielded to him. I now yield him 2 more minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Madam President, according to my understanding, the Federal Government purchases utility services in the following amounts: \$817 million generally, plus \$386 million for communications, plus \$2,106,000 for transportation. These amount to a total of \$3,309 million. I submit that the expenditure of \$300,000 by the General Services Administration is completely justified, in order to have it watch as to how the rates are being fixed.

I concede the correctness of the proposal made by the Senator from Illinois; but I submit that this part of the ap-



propriation bill contemplates depriving the General Services Administration of every ability it has to protect the Federal Government and to insure that the rates it is charged are not excessive.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have only a little time available.

Let me point out that in 1961, we spent \$390 million for this service; in 1960, \$368 million; in 1959, \$357 million; and in 1958, \$338 million. It nows appears that this service will be stripped of practically every penny, if this amendment is agreed to.

I cannot see it, and I do not state that proposition on the basis of engaging in a private-versus-public utility argument. I think the general public is entitled to this protection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, because of the uncertainty of the many Senators who have discussed this issue this afternoon, in the realm of duplication, and because of some serious misgivings about the particular intent of the language, it seems to me the intelligent way to act on this question is not in conference, but on new legislation before the proper legislative committee.

For that reason, I shall oppose the inclusion of the language, and I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

I think, as an interested spectator to the discussion this afternoon, it would be fair to say that if those who want to limit GSA are correct in their charges of duplication, the worst that can be said is that the public interest, really, is being doubly protected for the time being. That is the worst that can happen.

If, on the other hand, those who seek to defend the GSA position are correct, they are holding the line for a very necessary function of that body. Because of the doubts expressed here, I think it would be the better part of wisdom for this body to turn this question over to the field of original legislation, after hearings on the questions involved.

The committee has placed language in its report and in the bill which would, I believe, significantly restrict the operations of the General Services Administration in a field of activity which is extremely important both to the taxpayer and to the consumer. This activity is the representation of the Government before regulatory agencies as a user or consumer of transportation and public utilities.

It seems to me that there is serious doubt whether this action or the companion measure of reducing the fund available for such representation by 77 percent is wise.

In the first place, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act—section 201, title 40 United States Code, section 481—provides that the Administrator of the General Services shall "with respect to transportation and

other public utility services for the use of executive agencies, represent such agencies in proceedings involving carriers or other public utilities before State and Federal regulatory agencies." The language of the committee amendment appears to be a limitation of the exercise of this specific statutory authorization.

In the second place, the GSA has saved the American taxpayer millions of dollars by reducing the public utilities, communications, and transportation charges paid by Government agencies.

In the third place, the individual private consumer of these services and utilities is often benefitted by this action of the GSA because reductions secured by the GSA also redound to his benefit.

Although I cannot pretend to be an expert in this field, it is very difficult for me to see how the GSA can be expected to represent the Government effectively as a user for the purpose of insuring that the rates and services provided to the Government are reasonable and fair in comparison to the rates charge other users if they cannot present evidence and argument covering such questions of regulatory policy as rate of return and valuation.

Whether a specific rate proposed to be charged by an individual carrier is fair and reasonable as it applies to the Government would appear to depend not only on the question of whether it was comparable to rates charged other consumers for the same services, but also upon such elements as cost and return which make up the rate. In any case, the fact that this language is now proposed to be inserted in this appropriations bill points up the fact that there was no similar limitation or prohibition in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. Therefore, since it seems to me that the adoption of this language in the bill presently before us would in reality be an amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, because it would change the nature of the activities which the GSA was directed by that act to undertake, I think that this language ought to be introduced as a bill and referred to the appropriate legislative committee, whether a point of order is deemed to lie by the parliamentarian or not.

In light of the serious doubts raised in my mind by all of these factors, I should like to go on record as opposing both the insertion of this language in the bill and the reduction of the GSA's budget for this purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, I rise in support of the Proxmire amendment. Now, if ever, the consumer is entitled to have increased protection and more effective representation. It is clear that the very opposite would be the case if the committee's amendment prevailed. I hope the Proxmire amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, in the hearings before regulatory commis-

sions where the General Services Administration has carried out this activity, it has obtained great reductions in cost for the public, amounting to \$160 million, and in turn it has prevented increases of many millions more. The truth is that Government rates are largely fixed by general rates established by both State commissions and Federal commissions; and if the general rates are high, Government costs and expenditures are correspondingly high.

In these cases, both before Federal and State bodies, the interests of the consumers are very inadequately represented. I think the majority of the State commissions do not initiate actions, do not present much if any evidence themselves, and act solely in a judicial capacity, throw in the burden on both municipalities and individual consumers who lack the funds, expert knowledge, and ability satisfactorily to urge their case on behalf of the public.

We all know what is behind this move. The General Services Administration has obtained reductions of \$145 to \$150 million from the A.T. & T. The proposal of the committee is a reprisal against the good work of the GSA in recovering these millions from A.T. & T.

I support the Proxmire amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the language in the bill which my amendment would strike out does two things. First, it cuts the Transportation and Public Utilities' Service budget by 77 percent. That means it cannot possibly do a good job. That is what the Senate is asked to do. Some of that amount may be recovered in conference, but to adopt the committee amendment here would result in a reduction of 77 percent of that budget.

In the second place, the committee recommends language that provides that GSA cannot appear before such bodies concerning overall policy or earnings levels or transportation charges. The Senator from Illinois made an eloquent plea that this could not be done in State bodies. He could not be more mistaken. A State body is sovereign and could make the decision. This measure would not prohibit the Public Utilities Commission from appearing before Federal bodies.

As Representative VINSON and Representative McCORMACK showed so well in the House, the GSA saved the taxpayers \$83 million a year, or \$830 million over a 10-year period. Mr. VINSON is a very responsible, thoughtful, and careful person. This is his estimate of the savings made by this agency in the past. I think they can be made in the future.

I do not think anyone believes the consumer is overrepresented before regulatory bodies. We all know the contrary is true.

For this reason, I hope the amendment will be adopted. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amend-



ment of the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the role.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). Madam President, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is unavoidably detained for the moment. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 116]

YEAS—32

|            |              |                |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson   | Humphrey     | Moss           |
| Bartlett   | Jackson      | Muskie         |
| Carroll    | Lausche      | Neuberger      |
| Case, N.J. | Long, Hawaii | Pastore        |
| Church     | Long, La.    | Pell           |
| Clark      | Mansfield    | Proxmire       |
| Dodd       | McGee        | Smith, Mass.   |
| Douglas    | McNamara     | Wiley          |
| Gruening   | Metcalf      | Williams, N.J. |
| Hart       | Monroney     | Young, Ohio    |
| Hartke     | Morse        |                |

NAYS—55

|               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Aiken         | Ervin        | Prouty         |
| Beall         | Fong         | Randolph       |
| Bennett       | Fulbright    | Robertson      |
| Bible         | Goldwater    | Russell        |
| Boggs         | Hayden       | Saltonstall    |
| Bridges       | Hickenlooper | Schoeppel      |
| Bush          | Hickey       | Scott          |
| Byrd, Va.     | Hill         | Smathers       |
| Byrd, W. Va.  | Holland      | Smith, Maine   |
| Cannon        | Johnston     | Sparkman       |
| Capehart      | Jordan       | Stennis        |
| Carlson       | Keating      | Symington      |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kuchel       | Talmadge       |
| Cotton        | Long, Mo.    | Thurmond       |
| Curtis        | Magnuson     | Tower          |
| Dworshak      | McClellan    | Williams, Del. |
| Eastland      | Miller       | Young, N. Dak. |
| Ellender      | Morton       |                |
| Engle         | Mundt        |                |

NOT VOTING—13

|         |          |            |
|---------|----------|------------|
| Allott  | Dirksen  | Kerr       |
| Burdick | Gore     | McCarthy   |
| Butler  | Hruska   | Yarborough |
| Chavez  | Javits   |            |
| Cooper  | Kefauver |            |

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$38,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$36,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, it is my understanding—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have discussed the possibility of a unanimous-consent

agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished minority leader and others, and with the approval of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and 5 minutes under the control of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I ask the Senator to yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I shall be very brief on the amendment. Obviously I must be brief, since I have only 5 minutes.

We started to discuss the amendment on Saturday. The amendment is a part of an effort on my part to reduce the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations to the administration's requests. The amendment is directed to the item which would increase the appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense Mobilization by \$2½ million. The OCDM at no time asked for \$2,500,000. The statement in both the Senate and House hearings was this:

With such an appropriation deliveries \* \* \* should assure the establishment by June 30, 1963, of the minimal 100,000 Federal, State, and local monitoring stations required.

It was argued and contended in the hearings that if the item of \$2,500,000 were allowed to stand, additional radiological defense equipment could be obtained and an economy could be achieved. But it is obvious that with the change which is contemplated, the equipment will not now be needed. It is possible that there may be a saving in the future.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Office of Defense Mobilization is undergoing decisive change. The President has recommended that the agency be taken under the wing of the Defense Department. He has also recommended a tripling in appropriations for the purpose. Under those circumstances it seems to me that it would be unwise for the Senate to make an appropriation for a long term expenditure of this kind when the President has not asked for it, the Budget Bureau has not asked for it, and the agency itself has not asked for it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

(At this point Mr. METCALF took the chair.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee restored \$14,400,000 to provide the budget estimate of \$36 million. It is true that some items were cut down, and some reductions were made in the Office of Defense Mobilization. But the



total is the budgeted amount. Twelve million four hundred twenty-five thousand dollars was restored for medical supplies and equipment. An additional \$24,850,000 was requested to allow for the procurement of 1,000 additional 200-bed civil defense emergency hospitals to be placed in local communities throughout the country for emergency use. There are now 1,932 of them. Any reduction would require larger expenditure in future years.

Four hundred and forty-five thousand dollars was restored to stockpile management, to be used for packaging supplies for the new emergency hospitals and to maintain the stockpile.

One million, five hundred thousand dollars was restored to radiological defense equipment in order to carry on the program for establishment of nationwide radiological detection and monitoring network to inform and advise the public as to radiation hazards within each locality following a nuclear attack.

Twenty-five thousand stations are now established, 27,000 more are planned by next year, and the objective of 100,000 stations is planned for December 31, 1963. The basis of progress in the program is the furnishing of an equipment kit, with survey meters and dosimeters for each station at a cost of about \$100.

The committee was impressed with the statement of Mr. Ellis of OCDM that if the amount of \$5,615,000 estimated for these kits in 1962 could be doubled, the Government would be saved a great deal of money because of volume production. In other words, we could buy them cheaper now than later. For those reasons the committee added \$2,500,000.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "Nay" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "Yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mc-

CARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "Nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 117]

YEAS—40

|               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson      | Cotton       | Moss           |
| Bartlett      | Curtis       | Mundt          |
| Beall         | Douglas      | Neuberger      |
| Bennett       | Dworshak     | Proxmire       |
| Boggs         | Goldwater    | Roy            |
| Bush          | Gruening     | Symington      |
| Byrd, Va.     | Hickenlooper | Talmadge       |
| Cannon        | Keating      | Thurmond       |
| Capehart      | Lausche      | Tower          |
| Carlson       | Long, Mo.    | Wiley          |
| Case, N.J.    | Long, Hawaii | Williams, Del. |
| Case, S. Dak. | Miller       | Young, Ohio    |
| Church        | Morse        |                |
| Clark         | Morton       |                |

NAYS—47

|              |           |                |
|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| Alken        | Holland   | Pastore        |
| Bible        | Humphrey  | Pell           |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Jackson   | Prouty         |
| Carroll      | Javits    | Randolph       |
| Dirksen      | Johnston  | Russell        |
| Dodd         | Jordan    | Saltonstall    |
| Eastland     | Kuchel    | Schoeppel      |
| Ellender     | Long, La. | Scott          |
| Engle        | Magnuson  | Smathers       |
| Ervin        | Mansfield | Smith, Mass.   |
| Fong         | McClellan | Smith, Maine   |
| Hart         | McGee     | Sparkman       |
| Hartke       | McNamara  | Stennis        |
| Hayden       | Metcalf   | Williams, N.J. |
| Hickey       | Monroney  | Young, N. Dak. |
| Hill         | Muskie    |                |

NOT VOTING—13

|         |           |            |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Allott  | Cooper    | Kerr       |
| Bridges | Fulbright | McCarthy   |
| Burdick | Gore      | Yarborough |
| Butler  | Hruska    |            |
| Chavez  | Kefauver  |            |

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I offer my amendment identified as 7-27-61—H, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### "OFFICIAL REGISTER OF THE UNITED STATES"

"For necessary expenses incurred in the compilation, editing, indexing, and publishing of the Official Register of the United States, \$30,000: *Provided*, That the United States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be compiled, edited, indexed, and published each year an Official Register of the United States, which shall contain a full and complete list of all persons occupying administrative and supervisory positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, including the District of Columbia, in connection with which salaries are paid from the Treasury of the United States. The register shall show the name; official title; salary, compensation, and emolument; legal residence and place of employment for each person listed therein: *Provided, however*, That the Official Register shall not contain the name of any postmaster or assistant postmaster, or any officer of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, unless such officer is assigned as an administrative officer. To enable the United States Civil Service Commission to compile and publish the Official Register of the United States on or before December 31 of each year, the Executive Office, the legislative and judicial branches of the Government, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the head of each executive department, independent office, establishment, and commission of the Government shall, as of the 1st day of May of each year, supply to the United States Civil Service Commission the data required by this section, upon forms approved and furnished by the Commission, in due time to permit the publication of the Official Register as provided in this section; and no extra compensation shall be allowed to any officer, clerk, or employee of the United States Civil Service Commission for compiling the Official Register.

#### LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be allocated for the consideration of the Javits amendment 30 minutes, with 15 minutes to each side.

Mr. HOLLAND. What amendment is now being considered?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Javits amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are several Javits amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York identified as 7-27-61—H.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana to limit debate on the Javits amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. What is the time allocation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A total of 30 minutes, with 15 minutes to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader about his plans for the remainder of the day. Does he intend to have the Senate dispose of the pending bill and then, perhaps, adjourn or take up some other matter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is our hope that we may finish consideration of the pending bill this evening and then proceed to consider the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and make it the unfinished business.



ness for tomorrow. I hope, furthermore, that tomorrow other measures, in addition to the HEW appropriation bill, may be considered, and that perhaps at the conclusion of business tomorrow night, or the first thing on Wednesday, the Senate may proceed to consider the foreign aid bill.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from New York yield himself?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 10 minutes.

The amendment seeks to restore in the appropriation bill the appropriation for the Official Register, which was published for more than 140 years, and was discontinued only last year. The amendment provides \$30,000, which is the approximate cost of printing the Official Register.

The amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill; hence, I gave notice, as required by the rules, that I would move to suspend the rule for the purpose of adopting the amendment.

I hereby so move.

The reason for including this particular item in the appropriation bill is that it was taken out by an appropriation bill a year ago. So it seems fair to me that the question be tested, to let the Senate give its judgment upon the validity of claims which were made by a large part of the American press corps that it was very inadvisable to end the publication of the Official Register.

I call attention to a letter which appears at page 775 of the record of the hearings on the bill, from the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The letter is signed by John H. Colburn, on behalf of the organization, and reads, in part:

As a strong advocate of economy, I would like to suggest that the \$30,000 saved annually by not printing the Official Register is not a true saving and furthermore is false economy in that there is a genuine need for the Register.

The letter affirms the fact that a large part of the American press corps is interested in retaining this publication.

The analogy between what is contained in the Official Register, which contains, in accordance with its title—and I have here a copy of the 1959 publication—a list of persons occupying administrative and supervisory positions

in the various echelons of the Government, together with the salary which is paid to each, and the other compensation and emoluments, the legal residence, the place of employment, and the official title—the analogy is with our own order, not so very long ago, to publish what we spend in respect of our staffs, so that the public may have a complete sense of stewardship in terms of accounting.

The Civil Service Commission and the committee say that the Official Register is unnecessary and that its publication should be discontinued because the information contained in the Register is contained in two other documents, which I have available also, if any Senator is interested to see them—the U.S. Government Organization Manual and the Congressional Directory.

In the first place, all the employees who are named in the Official Register are not included by either of the other documents, although they contain a great many of those names. Second, it does not include the compensation or other emoluments which they receive. So far as public information is concerned, this is a very important point. It enables the press, ourselves, and anyone else in the country to see at a glance, what the highest paid positions in Government are. This is a very important point when we are trying to live, as we are more and more, in the public domain.

The other point the Civil Service Commission makes is that it would cost \$42,000 instead of \$32,000 to print the Official Register. I do not believe anyone will for a moment be concerned about the cost involved, if it is really felt that the document would serve a useful purpose. I respectfully submit that with the affirmation we have from the press corps—and I have just read an excerpt from a letter received from the American Society of Newspaper Editors—and with the fact that this document does contain information in terms of compensation, at least, which is not contained in other documents, and with the fact that it consolidates under one heading the major positions in the agencies, in a way which the other documents referred to by the Civil Service Commission do not, and coupled with the position which we are seeking to espouse, to live in a goldfish bowl, so far as finances are concerned, I deeply feel that the publication of the Official Register, which had been published almost for the duration of the Republic—since President Madison's time—should be restored by the action of the Senate.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I express my support for the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from New York. The Official Register is an extremely valuable Government document, and its cost, relatively speaking, is minimal.

There is no other single, comprehensive source in the Government of the names of persons who are employed in professional capacities and of the sal-

aries which they receive. Certainly the public has a right to this information. The salary levels of key Federal officials is important information and generally is a good indication of the relative importance of given positions and agencies within the executive branch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter which I addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], in connection with this subject. The letter explains my views in greater detail.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 23, 1961.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that you will today consider the amendment which I cosponsored with my colleague, Senator JAVITS, to authorize the resumption of the publication of the Official Register of the United States.

I believe this is an extremely important proposal. It is my hope that your subcommittee will act favorably on the inclusion of this measure in the independent offices appropriations bill.

I was quite concerned that a decision was made some months ago to suspend the publication of this extremely useful publication. There is no other single, comprehensive source for obtaining information about the people who hold key positions in our Government and the relative importance of these positions as indicated by the salaries which they receive. The right of the public to know and have ready access to this information is certainly basic to our system of government.

I know that your subcommittee will give this legislation the full attention which I believe it deserves. If in any way I can be of further assistance, I shall be glad to do so.

With best personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last year the Committee on Appropriations eliminated funds for the publication of the Official Register, mainly on the basis of the testimony of the Civil Service Commission. At that time, when he was asked whether the Commission considered the publication of the Official Register to be important, Chairman Jones expressed the view that it was not important. A similar question was raised in the Senate hearings on the budget for fiscal 1962. Chairman Macy stated that the elimination of the Official Register did not appear to constitute any particular loss of information, and that the Congressional Directory and the Organization Manual, which are still being published, provided a part of the information which formerly was contained in the Official Register.

It was said that because of the time required to obtain information from the agencies in order to prepare the Official Register for printing, the personnel information was inaccurate prior to its publication. In other words, by the time the publication was ready for distribution, the data relating to personnel had become outdated.

Furthermore, it is not quite accurate to say that it would cost \$30,000 annually



to print the document. Another \$12,000 would be required for clerical assistance to do the research for the publication, so the total would be \$42,000.

It is true that the Civil Service Commission said it would be glad to publish the Official Register if Congress desired it to do so. However, the enabling law has been repealed. I think we could let this item go. If there is a sufficient demand for it, I do not believe there will be too much objection to passing the authorization law again, for it will be necessary to pass another law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee had really no alternative on this item, because last year the House eliminated the \$30,000 and told the Civil Service Commission, in the law, that it was not to use any money for the publication of the Official Register. So the House asked the Senate to repeal the law. We struck out the item in last year's appropriation bill, so there is no law now in effect.

As the Senator from New York has said, it will be necessary to suspend the rule by a two-thirds vote before placing the law on the books again.

I favored the repeal of the law last year, because I did not think the Official Register was worth \$30,000 a year. That is what it would cost if the law were reinstated and then Congress agreed to appropriate funds to print the Register.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from New York will not prevail.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would not a two-thirds vote be required to suspend the rule to enable the Senate to agree to act on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would require a two-thirds vote to suspend the rule if a point of order were made against the amendment. No point of order has been made as yet. So the vote would come upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I make the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from New York is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been made; therefore, a motion to suspend the rule would be in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from New York that I believe the Official Register could have become a valuable document if enough advantage had been taken of it; but the preponderance of the testimony was that not many persons wished to use it. Hardly anyone asked for it. It was distributed to Senators and Representatives. Because of the lack of demand, it was thought perhaps that the Register had no value. However, I think it could be valuable if it were kept up to date;

but if it is to be kept up to date, it will be necessary to pay a little more than \$42,000 for its publication.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Washington says there has been little demand for the Register. Its publication has been discontinued for 1 year. Now there is a demand. I call attention again to the letter from the American Society of Newspaper Editors, which indicates there is a demand. The letter represents the view of the Society of Newspaper Editors that the Official Register is a deserving publication. The Senator from Washington, I think, and I have heard from some leading newspapermen in New York, reiterating that demand.

Another point which I should like to make is that aside from the salaries, this document also lists the States from which the individual high officials of the government come.

Finally, Mr. President, if publication is not resumed, all continuity in connection with this matter will be lost.

I think the Senator knows, from his vast experience on the Appropriations Committee, that the Government departments will be spending more than \$242,000 merely to give to the press information on public officials. The departments spend a great deal of money in issuing to the press and to the public generally information on various public officials. So in any case considerable sums of money will be spent in connection with such matters; the only difference will be that if this publication is discontinued, the job will be a selective one and much less extensive.

So I really think this publication should not be discontinued.

Furthermore, if this publication is resumed, I see no reason why a charge should not be made for it. I have always thought—and it has been tried in many localities and States—that payment should be made for many of the services rendered by the Government. For example, the other day, in discussing the situation as regards the FPC, we learned that it could charge more in fees, in order to recoup its expenses in connection with the provision of some of its services.

I did not dream up this amendment. My colleague [Mr. KEATING] and I are sponsoring it at the request of members of the press in New York. That fact is borne out by the testimony submitted on behalf of the Society of Newspaper Editors.

I should like to point out that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is necessarily absent at this time, wishes me to state that he is very much in favor of this item. In his letter, which appears on page 774 of the hearings, he stated:

It is my understanding that Thomas Jefferson, in his inaugural address, described the need for a listing of Government personnel to help citizens, and journalists, as well as Government officials themselves. In 1802 the first complete roster was issued. Over the years, this roster has increased in size and importance as new agencies and offices were added. Last year, however, the Register was not printed. A long tradition of public service was suddenly ended.

Mr. President, I do not say it was wrong for the other body to vote to discontinue this publication, in order to see whether its lack would be felt. However, I point out that its lack has been felt.

So I hope this item will be taken to conference, so that there will be opportunity to consider the sentiment which has been manifested to us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How much does the Senator's amendment call for?

The testimony of Mr. Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, was that it would be more than that.

However, I see no objection to discussing this subject again, in conference with the House conferees. So if there is no objection, we shall accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The House originated the abolition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendment should be read in full, because it is very important.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, in line 19, it is proposed to strike out the period, and insert a colon and the following:

*Provided, That no funds appropriated by this Act shall be paid for the liquidation of contract obligations entered into under such authority, which provide for the construction of airport terminal buildings containing racially segregated dining or other facilities, whether or not the portions of such buildings containing such segregated facilities have been constructed without Federal contributions.*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Washington that this is a very serious amendment; and I invite the close attention of Senators to its discussion, because I think it raises some very fundamental constitutional and policy questions.

The purpose of the amendment is to cut off funds which are utilized to support federally financed airport buildings, where advantage has been taken—and I do not use the word in an invidious sense—of the existence of the shell of the airport structure, to incorporate in it either restaurants, restrooms, or waiting rooms which are racially segregated.

I called this matter to the attention of the Senate last year, when the independent offices appropriation bill was being considered. At that time a motion to lay this amendment on the table was made, and the motion to lay it on the table was agreed to. I understand that it is very likely that such a motion will be made this time, although I hope very much it will not succeed.

But regardless of that, I should like to report to the Senate that a good deal has been accomplished merely by raising this very serious question, for regardless



of whatever people may think about the desirability of the social order which one of our very distinguished Senators calls the social order of the South, the fact is that two principles are involved in this amendment. One is that when Federal funds—the funds of all the taxpayers of the United States, without regard to their race, creed, or color—are used, they should be used for the benefit of all taxpayers, without the indignity of making some of them use special facilities because of their race, creed, or color.

The second principle is that if anything is embodied in our statute law with relation both to airports and to bus transportation, it is here that there shall be no discrimination in their use.

As regards bus transportation, the courts have held very clearly that there shall be no discrimination in their use. The Interstate Commerce Commission is now, at long last, proceeding with fundamental rules and regulations to carry out that policy. Indeed, the provision of the act relating to Federal airports is, if anything, more clear than the provision in regard to buses. I am very happy to state that the Attorney General of the United States has already started one suit to desegregate the airport at New Orleans; and the other day we were advised, by information published in the Washington Post, that the Department of Justice intends also to move against the airport at Montgomery, Ala.

The amendment which I have proposed would affect the following airports, in the following amounts:

At Birmingham, Ala., where the aggregate Federal payment was \$916,025, of which \$682,877 is unpaid.

At Tallahassee, Fla., where the aggregate Federal payment was \$977,800, of which \$140,000 is unpaid.

At Montgomery, Ala.—the very airport to which I referred a moment ago as being the subject of a prospective suit by the Attorney General—where the aggregate amount is \$464,923, of which \$52,550 is unpaid.

Also the airports at Meridian, Miss., and Natchez, Tenn., as to which only small amounts remain unpaid—\$150,000, in one case; and about \$6,000, in the other.

It will be said that these amounts are not very great. But, Mr. President, they represent the very fundamental principle which is involved in this entire proposition.

I repeat that regardless of whatever one may think about whether the Federal Government should or should not pass civil rights laws—and the Senate passed one in 1957, and another in 1960—it seems to me that these arguments can hardly apply to a situation in which we are dealing with Federal funds and in which we are dealing with Federal law which specifically states that there shall be no discrimination or segregation in the use of the facilities.

This situation, which I called to the attention of the Senate a year ago, was very much worse when I called it to the attention of the Senate than it is now. A year ago the rules and regulations of the predecessor organization to the FAA

specifically contemplated that its own regulations might be avoided by a municipality contracting for the construction of the airport building, but not for the construction of the segregated facilities, itself putting up the small amount of money which that shell cost and having those facilities segregated. The very rules of the agency contemplated that precisely that kind of thing could be done.

This was really an outrageous situation in terms of the Constitution and the people of our country. At least, I am pleased to report that some progress has been made, in that in the new regulations issued by the FAA there is a provision that no such thing will be tolerated.

Section 3.060701 of the regulations, entitled "Eligibility," of the new FAA policy memorandum is as follows:

Where a request is received for FAAP participation in the construction of a terminal building, it will be necessary as a part of the programing recommendations to include a statement in writing from the chief executive officer of the sponsor as to whether or not it is the intent of the sponsor that all of the areas and facilities in the airport buildings, including the building proposed for construction, will be available without regard to race, creed, or color, and are operated, and are intended to be operated on a nonsegregated basis. In addition, the program recommendation should include a statement from the region as to whether segregation is practiced in the airport buildings and whether it is recommended that the particular terminal building be included in the approved program.

That is a very much improved situation in terms of the rules and regulations of the FAA, but I point out that the segregated situation continues to exist in airports for which we are asked to appropriate funds.

That brings me to the argument which was made last year, and which I have little doubt will be made again, if we ever reach that stage in this debate—that these are contractual payments provided for by contracts made with the municipalities, and therefore it would be a breach of contract not to make the payments of appropriate money for that purpose.

Mr. President, I yield to no one—and I think I have shown it in many votes—in my respect for the integrity of the promise of the United States, even if it is sometimes strictly legally binding. There is also in the law the doctrine of ultra vires, and that doctrine applies equally to a sovereign as to anyone else. I respectfully submit, in answer to the argument, that if it is done pursuant to a contract, it is beyond the power of the U.S. Constitution, and under the law as it relates to the FAA itself to agree to make payment for airport shells which contain segregated facilities.

I submit that the Agency has recognized that fact in the new rules and regulations, but that rather late recognition does not say what it did before under its previous regulation.

I have said before, and I say again, that it is not easy to propose to the Senate an amendment of this character. I know it, and the Senator from Connecticut, who was present a moment ago, and

who proposed such an amendment on another bill, knows it. There is a certain "freeze" which occurs in the Senate when a Member of this body offers this kind of amendment.

Whatever may be the differences of view between Members of the Senate, it is my deep conviction—and vote after vote upon this issue has shown it to be so—that the great majority of the country construes the Constitution to mean that the Constitution does not tolerate discrimination on the ground of race, creed, or color, and whenever we permit it, we are waiving or suspending the Constitution, because that is certainly not its intent or design, especially when one finds, in an administrative sense, that the executive agency concerned is either unable or unwilling to effectuate the intents and purposes of the Constitution.

In this case, as I understand, the Agency has no intention of not making these payments unless we attach a condition in this appropriation bill with respect to denial of payment.

I respectfully submit that, as we respect the Constitution and the laws of our country, and the spirit in which they are to be applied, this is the fair thing to do.

I close upon this note: Airports are used by many visitors from abroad. They are used by diplomats, as well as by citizens of the United States.

We are judged not by what we say but by what we do. Any American's heart must weep when he goes to an international airport in a great American city and sees a sign over the door, however that sign may be disguised, which indicates that it is for white only or colored only. Often the signs read, "By Order of Local Police," in order to avoid the implication that it is an order of another agency. Or it may read, "For Intrastate Passengers Only," when in reality we are dealing with interstate facilities. But an American's heart must truly weep to see a sign over a door in this country which says, in effect, "White Only," or "Colored Only."

When are we going to grow up and realize that two-thirds of the people on earth are yellow, black, or brown? Many eloquent words have been uttered on the floor of the Senate with respect to the deadly menace to the free world with reference to Communist China. China has 600 million people—600 million people who are yellow in color, and who identify themselves with other people of color in the world, whether they are in the United States or the Union of South Africa.

I know of few issues—indeed, I know of no issue—technically domestic in character which is more portentous in terms of what will happen to our world than the issue of what will happen in the United States on this question. I have received many communications from Indonesia and other countries. They do not ask the impossible. They do not ask the millennium. They do not ask for a tyranny to stop this practice by the use of troops, or other means of that kind. They ask only that we do the best we can, when the opportunity



is here, to strike a blow for the equality of mankind in the way I am trying to do.

I hope very much that my colleagues will understand the issue very well. This may be one of the few opportunities we shall have to express ourselves in this Chamber, because I think the administration has very unwisely refrained from asking the Congress for civil rights legislation, which is urgently needed with respect to school desegregation and other matters, in this session. This may be one of the few times when Members of this body can express themselves on issues as fundamental as this for the security of our country and the cause of freedom in the world. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has yielded to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield to other Senators in a moment.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank my colleague from New York. I associate myself with him in this amendment and the effort he has made on this occasion, and on innumerable occasions in the past—and I know he will continue the effort in the future—to bring about a greater measure of social justice and just plain decency in this country in matters of this kind.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I join the Senator from New Jersey in expressing support for the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague. It is high time we adopted such an amendment. I commend him for it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the issue raised by the Senator from New York was presented to the Senate last year during the consideration of the independent offices appropriations bill for fiscal 1961. At that time the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAGNUSON], moved to table the amendment of the Senator from New York, and the Senate supported the tabling motion by a majority of 2 to 1.

It appears to me that there are even more compelling reasons for tabling the amendment this year.

First of all, the Federal Aviation Agency is not now entering into grant agreements for the construction of airport terminals. Its funds are entirely committed to priority items such as safety devices, landing control systems, and so forth. Therefore, the only effect of the amendment would be on grant agreements made in previous years, where final Federal payments have not been made.

Parenthetically, I may say that should the FAA in the future have sufficient

funds for participating in terminal construction grants, it will not participate in any such grant where public facilities are segregated. The Agency's former policy was to participate only in the part of the terminal that did not contain racially segregated facilities. On October 28, 1960, the FAA adopted a new policy, whereby it will not participate to any degree in airport terminal construction where public facilities are to be segregated.

Secondly, the amendment is clearly of a legislative character. It effects a change in existing contractual relationships between the United States and a very small number of airport sponsors. If such a change should be made, clearly it should be made as an amendment to the Airport Act. And I pledge my support to an amendment to that act which will write into law the present FAA policy—that is, to deny Federal participation in any future terminal construction where public facilities are to be racially segregated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out that the act is very clear on this subject. The present act forbids such practice. No further law is necessary. The question is, shall we pay these contract commitments when there actually are segregated facilities in these airports?

I ask the Senator also, while I am on my feet, if he has any objection to a yea-and-nay vote on the motion to table?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, third, were this amendment to be adopted by the Senate it would assuredly be held to be legislation on an appropriation bill under the precedents of the House. So it would be, from the Senate's point of view, an exercise of futility.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the position taken by the distinguished majority leader. The amendments to the Federal Aviation Act which we hope to pass, to authorize Federal construction, would deny any Federal aid to any airport building except the parts housing safety facilities. What we are discussing in connection with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York will not bother us again. That has been a trouble source, because we know that in certain areas of our country the Federal Government is paying 50 percent of the airport terminal construction cost remaining after deducting the cost of segregated portions of the building.

The new bill would not provide one thin dime for any construction of space used by the public.

What we now have under consideration is a residual amount, which is due under grant agreements executed before the distinguished Senator from New York made his fight last year. As a

result of that fight, which called attention to the fact that perhaps Congress wished more severe restrictions than were then in force against segregated facilities, the rules were tightened as the Senator from Montana has said, in October of 1960.

However, in earlier years grants were made for some buildings which have not yet been completely paid for. Most of the grants for terminals have been largely paid out of local contributions and Federal matching funds appropriated in prior years. However, in each of the projects covered in this bill the contracts which were entered into by the Federal Government, to pay the Government's share, denied any contribution to any facility which was to be segregated.

This did not refer to the shell of the building, but referred to any portion of the building. The square footage consumed by segregated dining facilities, lavatories, waiting rooms, or anything of that kind, even under those contracts, was required to be built fully at the expense of the local sponsoring body.

One might say that in respect to these segregated airport terminals, if the Federal share of the building was to be \$500,000 and the facilities—such as segregated dining facilities or segregated waiting rooms or segregated sanitary facilities—require \$100,000, the \$100,000 is completely taken out of the Federal share and the Federal share becomes \$400,000 and the municipality's share \$600,000.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Government is not permitting money to be used willy nilly, under the 50-50 matching formula, because the problem has been recognized. I have the contract language available, in the contracts entered into by these airports, if the Senator would like to see it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question of fact?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. The Senator has seen these, has he not?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, of course. I should like to confirm the Senator's statement of fact, because it is correct. I should like to point out another fact.

It is a fact, is it not, that the segregated facilities are in precisely the same structure as are the other facilities, for which the Federal Government has paid its full participating share?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. It is not a different structure, but it is the same structure.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The second point is this: I am not a moralist. I am not trying to moralize for anyone else. It seems to me, considering the moral implications of what we do when we pay the Federal share for these facilities, it is a duty for people who feel as I do—and I think there are a good many of them in this Chamber—to say, "No; we cannot do it." That is really fundamental to the argument.



The Senator's statement of fact is absolutely correct. I think I stated most of the facts myself. I do not controvert those facts. It seems to me there is a moral decision as to whether we shall pay Federal money at an airport at which we are looking down the muzzle of the gun, at which we know there are segregated facilities in the same structure with other facilities for which the Government has paid. This, it seems to me, is offensive to my oath as a U.S. Senator, and I want to have the opportunity to say "No."

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate what the Senator has said. It is also offensive to me to have the mighty U.S. Government enter into valid contracts, saying, "You are going to have segregated facilities, so we will not contribute a thin dime for anything that is segregated," and then turn around, 2 years later, and say, "We will renege on a contract which the U.S. Government signed."

I do not approve that kind of law. When the Senator talks about the future, the Senator from New York knows very well that these fights have led to a complete abolition of Federal aid to terminal buildings. Now the local communities construct their buildings.

Under the Senator's proposal we would deny Federal funds to communities such as Tallahassee, Fla. Those funds, for instance, are to be used for the construction of a control tower. There is no segregation in the control tower, yet it is essential to safety of aviation. There are also funds for the weather services. It is absolutely essential that the airport have weather instrumentation and telegraphic equipment. The Senator's proposal would deny that at Tallahassee, because it is to be a part of the terminal building.

We have deducted the cost of all of those segregated facilities. We have made agreements that we will not pay a thin dime for any facility which is segregated. We made the contracts. I think we ought to stand by the pledged word of the United States.

For the future this problem has been corrected. The Senator won a victory. I do not think we can roll back, with an ex post facto law, by any amendment presented on the floor of the Senate, the obligations of the U.S. Government under an existing contract.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that according to the conception of law as we understand it, which we have now recognized, the community which imposed the segregation within those facilities was doing a wrong thing and was violating the law and the Constitution?

Mr. MONRONEY. The airports in my State have been unsegregated for years, perhaps more so than those in some of the other States. However, I feel that when the rules are laid down—that we would deduct the money for the square footage occupied in the terminal for all segregated facilities—that is what we should do. That was the old rule. We signed the contracts. We ought to abide by the contracts.

Perhaps the Senator does not wish to do so. I feel we have an obligation, for the whole body of Anglo-Saxon law rests on the sanctity of a contract.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of which the able Senator from Oklahoma is the chairman, I wish to take 1 minute to support his position. Everyone respects the sincerity and fervor of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on this question. But this is not the time or place for such an amendment. Our committee wrote the original bill in which these projects were authorized. The committee will report a bill this year which will provide that there can be no aid for terminal facilities. The subcommittee is unanimous in its position that the question of segregation will not arise again in the matter of airport aid. We have provided that it shall not.

To adopt this amendment to the appropriate bill merely seeks to break the pledged word of the United States and is not fulfilling a moral obligation to anybody. I hope the motion of the Senator from Montana will prevail.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is an important bill. It contains emergency funds requested by the President for the space program. The adoption of the Javits amendment would write a new clause into a small number of contracts still outstanding, and involving a limited amount of funds; and it would jeopardize and delay the adoption of a vital supply measure. While I agree with the principle of the Senator from New York's amendment, and will support this principle if it comes before the Senate as an amendment to the Airport Act, I am convinced it should not be adopted as an amendment to this bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion so that he may yield for a comment on one point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield briefly.

Mr. JAVITS. Very briefly, I wish to make one point. It is assumed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] that if the amendment is agreed to, the airports will not be segregated in order to receive their funds. After all, that is all the airports must do to receive their money.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The allotment of Federal funds would not encourage segregation. As I tried to make clear, the funds would be deductible for all facilities that were covered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana renew his motion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I renew my motion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 118]

YEAS—54

|              |              |                |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson     | Fulbright    | Monroney       |
| Bartlett     | Gruening     | Morton         |
| Bennett      | Hartke       | Moss           |
| Bible        | Hickenlooper | Pastore        |
| Boggs        | Hickey       | Pell           |
| Bridges      | Hill         | Prouty         |
| Byrd, Va.    | Holland      | Robertson      |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Jackson      | Russell        |
| Cannon       | Johnston     | Saltonstall    |
| Carlson      | Jordan       | Schoeppel      |
| Church       | Long, Hawaii | Smathers       |
| Cotton       | Long, La.    | Sparkman       |
| Curtis       | Magnuson     | Stennis        |
| Dirksen      | Mansfield    | Talmadge       |
| Dworshak     | McClellan    | Thurmond       |
| Eastland     | McGee        | Tower          |
| Ellender     | Metcalf      | Williams, Del. |
| Ervin        | Miller       | Young, N. Dak. |

NAYS—33

|       |               |         |
|-------|---------------|---------|
| Aiken | Carroll       | Clark   |
| Beall | Case, N.J.    | Dodd    |
| Bush  | Case, S. Dak. | Douglas |



|           |           |                |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| Engle     | Lausche   | Randolph       |
| Fong      | Long, Mo. | Scott          |
| Goldwater | McNamara  | Smith, Mass.   |
| Hart      | Morse     | Smith, Maine   |
| Humphrey  | Mundt     | Symington      |
| Javits    | Muskie    | Wiley          |
| Keating   | Neuberger | Williams, N.J. |
| Kuchel    | Proxmire  | Young, Ohio    |

## NOT VOTING—13

|          |          |            |
|----------|----------|------------|
| Allott   | Cooper   | Kerr       |
| Burdick  | Gore     | McCarthy   |
| Butler   | Hayden   | Yarborough |
| Capehart | Hruska   |            |
| Chavez   | Kefauver |            |

So Mr. MANSFIELD's motion to table Mr. JAVIT's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was about to inquire, for the benefit of the Senate and the majority leader and the minority leader, how many amendments are to be offered. I understand that the Senator from Alabama has an amendment, and the Senator from Wisconsin has an amendment also.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have two amendments. I will agree to a limitation of 10 minutes on each amendment, with 5 minutes to a side.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With respect to my amendment, I am not in a position to enter into an agreement, because the Senator from Michigan is interested in one phase of it, as is the Senator from New Jersey. I do not believe it will take much time, but I am not in a position to agree to a time limitation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the remaining two amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin be limited to 10 minutes on each amendment, with 5 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the Senator from Wisconsin and by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall cooperate in making my statement quite brief. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, after line 15 it is proposed to insert the following language:

## URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$450,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, my amendment would have the effect of restoring the House language on the subject of urban studies and housing research. My purpose in offering this amendment is to restore funds amounting to \$450,000 included in the House-passed version of this bill. The Housing Agency had originally requested \$900,000 for urban studies and housing research, and the House approved \$450,000.

In my opinion, the need for such a housing studies is vital. The Federal Government's financial involvement in all housing and related programs, such as urban renewal and general neighborhood development, is estimated at \$60 billion. Each year, the Congress, as well

as the executive branch of the Federal Government, is called upon to make decisions which directly affect the soundness of this investment. Necessarily these decisions not only affect the stability of the Federal Government's investment, but also have a direct effect upon this Nation's economic stability.

The fact is, however, many of these decisions must be made on the basis of surmise or "calculated guess," without the benefit of facts, statistics, or information to support the conclusion reached. How often, during the past 10 years have I heard the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency or, for that matter, the heads of constituent agencies answer to questions propounded by the members of the Housing Subcommittee—"We do not have any figures, we have no idea," or "The best available information is from figures compiled 10 years ago." Only this year when the question was raised about the number of families who would become eligible under the terms of the proposed bill which permitted no down-payment and 40-year mortgages, it was practically impossible to obtain an estimate on the number of such families.

Housing is a national problem, but very little is done toward developing a comprehensive study of this subject. This is not true in other programs in which the Federal Government is involved. For example, Federal funds are authorized or appropriated almost on a yearly basis for agricultural studies, for research in public health and public roads, for defense and foreign aid purposes, and for other purposes. Yet, there is no continuing research program that covers the one domestic issue which touches practically every American citizen, that is, a decent home and a suitable living environment.

At present, there is a vast amount of information "floating around" which, in some part, pertains to housing. Various private enterprise groups, as well as individuals, have developed volumes of information, some of which would be very valuable if it could be analyzed and separated into housing statistics. It is my understanding that the funds requested by the Housing Agency would be used in part to accomplish this purpose.

One of the studies for which the Agency requested funds related to housing conditions for the elderly. I understand that the basis for this study would require a special tabulation of 1960 census data at a cost of \$125,000.

The work would be done by the Census Bureau, but only in the event that some agency—in this case the Housing and Home Finance Agency—reimburses the Census Bureau for the expenditure.

According to the report on the appropriation bill—I refer to the middle of page 20—the committee feels that the studies for the elderly should continue, but it proposed waiting—and I should like the chairman to understand this point—until investigations are completed by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I checked with the chairman of that committee and found that no such investigation is planned. I also checked with the Special Committee on

the Aging and found that no investigation was contemplated by that committee.

I believe that this was an oversight and sincerely hope that the Housing Agency will be given the funds to obtain these data which are so urgently needed to help solve the housing problems of our elderly citizens.

As for the other items, I believe that it is extremely shortsighted to deny the Agency funds to make studies on the subject of housing need and quality. Year after year we are asked to legislate in an area about which there is so little known. Just a few weeks ago we passed a \$4.9 billion housing bill which has, as its main purpose, the elimination of substandard housing. But would you believe it—we do not really know how many substandard units there are in this Nation. Some witnesses before our committee said there were 1½ million; others said 16 million. To do an intelligent job, we must know more about our problem and we need information on the progress we are making in solving the problem.

This money requested by the Housing Agency is in accordance with an authority for such studies by the Congress in the Housing Act of 1956. This authority amounts to \$2.5 million but it has not been used because of what I think is a complete misunderstanding of what it would be used for. Part of the responsibility for this has been the failure of the Housing Agency officials to state clearly their case and to limit their request to the urgent matters that so obviously need study.

I believe the intent of the 1956 act was well spelled out in the Banking and Currency Committee report of that year.

One of the most urgent needs is information which will indicate present and prospective trends in the supply and demand for housing. The characteristics of the housing market must be better known—the volume of sales, the terms of financing, the trends in prices, and the physical types and sizes of recently completed units. It is also necessary to have much more accurate information regarding the availability of housing credit under various conditions in the housing market and the effect of housing credits on the volume of construction. A Government housing program cannot proceed in an enlightened and orderly fashion unless the housing agencies are informed about the housing needs of the people at all income levels and in all parts of the country. Information about such needs, together with related statistics on the market supply and demand, are indispensable to the most effective administration of HHFA.

A small expenditure of \$450,000, the better to understand the problems involved in administering a \$60 billion program is one of the best investments that I can conceive.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I assure Senators that the Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. We have neither the funds nor the know-how or jurisdiction to engage in these studies ourselves. We cannot do it.



Mr. MAGNUSON. To what studies is the Senator referring?

Mr. CLARK. Studies of housing for the elderly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To which the committee referred on page 20 of the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are checking the census data.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The census data have been gathered by the Bureau of the Census on 170 million cards; but in order to have them compiled so that they may be used, someone must do the work. The Bureau of the Census has estimated that the cost will be \$125,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are talking about going to the Bureau of the Census, which is only beginning to get some statistics relating to this particular field.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Someone will have to pay for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The Housing and Home Finance Agency said it needed information to administer the program of housing for the elderly and to develop new programs. Research for housing for the elderly can be done under another section of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; there are no funds for that purpose. No funds are available in the Housing and Home Finance Agency to carry on the research that is sought here. We cannot even do what the Committee on Appropriations says it wants done in this case, unless funds are authorized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Of the 11 studies which are proposed, there is no possibility of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare engaging in any of them. So far as studies with respect to housing for the elderly are concerned, I am chairman of the subcommittee of the special committee of which the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is chairman. We have neither the money nor the ability to conduct those studies, either. They all ought to be conducted by the agency.

I commend the Senator from Alabama for the position he has taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the Senator's amendment be printed at the conclusion of his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

See exhibit 1.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly for bringing up this subject. I hope that in the light of the testimony we have presented, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee will take the amendment as offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amount which the committee was considering involves 11 programs. They are as follows:

First, family displacement by governmental action.

Second, a special analysis of Census data on housing conditions of the elderly.

Third, statistics on sales price and volume of new homes.

Fourth, credit factors in mortgage foreclosures.

Fifth, techniques of local evaluation of nonresidential space.

Sixth, intermunicipal approaches to planning and renewal.

Seventh, the creation of an effective housing rehabilitation industry.

Eighth, standards of housing and neighborhood quality.

Ninth, the problems of adaptation of in-migrants to urban life.

Tenth, the optimum size of water and sewer facilities.

Eleventh, open space and land reservation requirements.

The committee examined into 11 different projects. It said it could understand some of them, and that it appeared that they should be provided for.

It is understood the need for a special analysis of census data on housing conditions with respect to the elderly, because Mr. Weaver testified that we could get a million dollars worth of information immediately.

I do not know what we would do with periodic statistics of sales prices and sales volume of new homes. That information can be obtained by calling the mortgage bankers.

I do not know about open space and land reservation requirements, or the development of techniques of local evaluation of nonresidential space land, restoration for development for the coming decade. We are told that the results of the study will be helpful to the agency in establishing large open space programs, for which the agency now has legislation. They want us to get the work done, so that they can justify their own legislation.

There is proposed a study of the optimum size of water and sewer facilities for various sized areas. It is said that this study will provide an organized body of information on the economy, scale, engineering design, capital outlays, and so forth, of area water systems, and that the results of the study will help the Community Facilities Administration to enable public facility experts to plan and construct efficient water and sewer systems. I presume the Bureau of Municipalities has that information. I know that theirs is a big agency.

I do not mean to deride these proposals, but there are so many of them that we did not know where to go or what to do.

Another program is that of adaptation of migrants to urban life. That is a sociological study—that is, the agency says it is.

Another program is to provide standards of housing and neighborhood quality. This program is designed to measure the changes in housing and neighborhoods, brought about by the deterioration or deficiency of housing and numerous environmental factors. I do not know whether that means termites, or what.

The point I make is that probably many of these studies should be undertaken, but the committee was uncertain as to how to proceed. No priority is stated, so again we thought we would find out what the House meant, when it provided for \$450,000 and determine which ones it thought should be provided for.

I should like to have the Senate know, however, that there was no question about housing for the elderly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But no money was provided for it. The point is that the 11 projects which are listed call for a total of \$900,000. The House apparently looked at them and decided that \$450,000 would be a satisfactory figure. However, the Senate committee struck out the entire amount. Yet in its report it acknowledged that the work in the field of housing for the elderly ought to continue, but provided not one dollar to carry on the work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are getting information from the Census Bureau.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, we are getting information from the Census Bureau. In the 1960 census, the Bureau compiled comparative data regarding housing throughout the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have considered this subject for many years. I have no objection, and I feel certain other Senators have no objection to providing \$125,000 for the housing for the elderly fund.

Another program is a study for the creation of an effective housing rehabilitation industry. This study is to determine how we can best encourage the providing for a complete one-stop rehabilitation service.

I do not know if any Senator can explain that. I do not know what is meant by a one-stop rehabilitation service.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a simple matter to take up individual terms and make them sound ridiculous.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am taking up the entire list.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I remember, for example, the time when the question was raised with respect to an item in an agricultural appropriation bill to study the sex life of the boll weevil. That sounded terrible. But down in the cotton-raising country it was important to know something about the life of the boll weevil, what its cycle might be, when its offspring might be expected, and so on and so forth. It was an important study, and Congress appropriated funds for it.

I am certain we could go through the various appropriations bills that provide for research and study, and find other items which sound just as ridiculous. I wish these terms had been stated in language that might seem more understandable. Nevertheless, it is the experts' way of stating them.

I do not think the committee should have ruled out the entire appropriation, merely because some of the items sounded funny.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?



The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This year, in the agricultural appropriation bill, we appropriated \$77 million for research, and included was a \$150,000 item to accelerate research on air-sac diseases of broilers and turkeys. I am not an authority on that matter; but if it is a problem, I will support research into it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, it is a very important problem. Its effect on the production of broilers—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what item is being considered?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was also glad to support the \$10,000 item for expansion of the research on dodder. I must confess that I do not know exactly what dodder is.

But we have shortchanged the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the one department of the Government which is most concerned with urban affairs. We always moan when we read the crime statistics for urban communities, the juvenile delinquency statistics, and the catalog of hardships that arise from the slums.

From 1948 to the present only a mere \$5 million was authorized to the Housing Agency for research, for basic studies in an effort to work our way out of the jungles which have developed in the metropolitan areas.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the unfortunate deletion by the Appropriations Committee of research funds for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. President, I cannot help saying that this elimination of new research funds for the fourth largest agency of the Federal Government, in terms of gross expenditures, would be outrageous if it were not so pathetic.

We all know full well that the massive problems affecting our urban and metropolitan areas constitute one of the most, if not the most, important national domestic problems. We are all aware of the terrible problems of slums, appalling traffic congestion, minority group ghettos, water pollution, air pollution, rising welfare costs, suburban sprawl, loss of open space, commercial decay, city crime, and juvenile delinquency.

These are a formidable array of problems. They carry profound social and economic implications of importance to the entire Nation. Yet now we are proposing to forbid the expenditure of a single cent for research on these problems.

The Housing Agency, which is the closest thing we have to the Department of Urban Affairs, and is the agency most directly concerned with these urban problems, has consistently been shortchanged, throughout its history, on funds for research.

From 1948 to 1954 only a mere \$5 million was authorized to the Housing Agency for research. At that time a Research Division was established in the Agency, to carry on these studies.

However, in 1954 this Research Division was liquidated—a tribute to our

monumental disregard to the problems facing the two-thirds of our population now living in our urban and metropolitan areas. Between 1954 and the present time, only \$75,000 was appropriated to conduct farm housing research. Today, we proposed to perpetuate our neglect of the fundamental task of understanding the problems we are trying to overcome with our various Federal-aid programs.

This refusal to appropriate research funds is sufficient indictment in itself. But I say frankly, Mr. President, that, when I look at the amount of funds appropriated for research for other agencies in this very bill, I find this omission little short of incredible.

I notice, for example, that the bill provides \$2.5 million to the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, for the development of measures and plans for civil defense, including evacuation and protection of life and property.

The bill provides \$60 million to the Federal Aviation Agency, for research, development, and service testing.

The bill provides \$32 million to the Veterans' Administration, for medical research. One million dollars of that sum is earmarked for prosthetic testing and development—that is, research for development of artificial parts for the body. This is more than double the amount of money provided by the House of Representatives for research in the whole area of housing and urban affairs.

I do not criticize these research appropriations. I merely call attention to the enormous disparity involved.

In pursuing this subject, I went to the trouble of examining the agriculture appropriation bill which was passed by both Houses last month. The comparisons here are even more astounding, when one considers the generosity of Congress in providing funds for research in agriculture, as opposed to research into housing and urban problems.

For example, the conferees agreed to appropriate \$77 million for the Agricultural Research Service, for research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services.

I notice that of this sum, \$150,000 is to accelerate the research on air-sac diseases of broilers and turkeys. This is one-third of the amount of money approved by the House of Representatives for research in the urban areas. One of the 11 studies that the HHFA had wanted to make was on the problem of family displacement by governmental action.

Surely the problem of the air-sac diseases of broilers and turkeys, important as it may be, pales into insignificance in contrast to the tremendous problems faced by thousands of families who each year are uprooted and displaced by urban renewal, highways, and other governmental actions.

The agriculture appropriation bill, as part of the \$77 million research appropriation I just mentioned, provides \$10,000 to expand research on dodder.

It provides \$25,000 to accelerate research on the cucumber beetle.

It provides \$15,000 to accelerate research on sugarbeets.

It provides \$25,000 to study the feasibility of special engineering research on mechanical aids in the harvesting of citrus crops.

It provides \$20,000 to strengthen research on crown rot and bacterial diseases affecting peach production in North Carolina and South Carolina.

It provides \$20,000 to expand research on windbreak shrubs at Cheyenne, Wyo.

It provides \$60,000 to accelerate research on rust strains affecting wheat, oats, and barley.

It provides \$5,000 for the housing of research machinery and equipment at Madison, S. Dak.

It provides \$5,000 for drainage research at East Franklin, Vt.

It provides \$37,500 to restore funds for soil and water research at Morris, Minn.

It provides \$65,500 to provide full operating funds for soil and conservation laboratories at Tempe, Ariz.; Oxford, Miss; Boise, Idaho; and Watkinsville, Ga.

Going on through the agriculture appropriation bill, I see that the conferees agreed to \$9 million for the economic research services of the Agriculture Department to conduct economic research and services relating to agricultural products, marketing and distribution, including analysis relating to farm prices, income and population, and demand for farm products. The bill even provided \$8,748,000 to conduct statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improving and marketing surveys. The bill also provides \$4,740,000 to the Agricultural Marketing Service, for research and development relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, included belated costs and efficiency evaluations. I notice that in the conference report it was indicated that of the \$4.7 million, \$130,000 was to develop plans and specifications for research facilities for peanuts and to accelerate marketing research on peanuts.

It provides \$10,000 for research on the maintenance of quality in citrus.

It provides \$10,000 to study methods for gaging the maturity of apples; and it provides \$75,000 for a marketing research project in Boston, Mass.

Surely it cannot be asking too much of the members of this body who are vitally interested in the research funds I have just now mentioned to request that they support the administration's request for \$900,000 for housing and urban research.

And what are some of the problems that would be studied if the money were made available? I have mentioned the problem of families displaced by governmental action.

The agency would also like to study intermunicipal approaches to planning and renewal, one of the most critical problems facing the metropolitan areas today—in short, how to obtain effective cooperation in programs that extend beyond a single jurisdiction.



These funds would also be used to evaluate census data on housing conditions of the elderly.

They would study the creation of an effective housing rehabilitation industry.

One of our greatest needs is for the development of effective mechanisms for restoring and revitalizing our metropolitan areas, rather than having to rely exclusively on the expensive techniques of the bulldozer.

Another critical problem proposed for study is the problem of the adaptation of immigrants to urban life.

Having worked extensively in this field, I can also say that we are badly in need of information on our urban open space and land reserve requirements—another study that the housing agency would undertake with these funds.

These are just some of the 11 studies that have been proposed. I could cite scores of others of equal or even more pressing importance.

Mr. President, it is about time we started paying as much attention to human beings as we pay to the problems of our broilers and turkeys, our sugarbeets, cucumber beetles, and peanuts.

I urge the Senate with strongest conviction to support the meager request of \$900,000 for housing and urban research by the administration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House provided \$450,000 for the 11 items. In the committee we said we would vote to eliminate these items, but would discuss them in conference, for we could not determine their relative value. So we did do that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was practically impossible for us to evaluate these items; and Mr. Weaver, in his testimony, said he did not know which should be proceeded with first, although he knew that the census figures were available for the item for which the \$150,000 appropriation was proposed. But he did not know which one should be proceeded with first.

So we were somewhat in a quandary. Perhaps all of them can be justified.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the chairman and if the Senator from Massachusetts are suggesting that the striking out of the \$450,000 item does not prejudice the case, and that they will sit down with the House conferees and will see how the \$450,000 will be distributed, which items will be covered, and what the priorities will be, I would have no objection to that understanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what I tried to say in the beginning.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But at the present time no such item is included in the Senate version of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, Mr. Weaver, because he is new, was going to take a look at these items; and then we were going to suggest to the House which ones seem to have priority and which ones seem to be the ones to go ahead with first, particularly in the case of the items relating to housing conditions and data on housing for the elderly. I am sure the Senator has a general

understanding that that is true. But I say frankly that we were somewhat confused by all these items.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, if we can have that understanding—although I am not committing the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who is in dead earnest regarding the necessity for studies in connection with housing for the elderly—

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was some suggestion that the Senator from Michigan was conducting a study, and would have some suggestions to make in regard to that matter. But in talking to him later, we found that the part of the study he is conducting involves culling out this information from the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And he is waiting for research funds to be provided to this agency, in order to make it possible for those studies to be compiled.

I am perfectly willing not to insist further on the amendment, with the assurance from the chairman of the subcommittee and from the Senator from Massachusetts, as I understand—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Massachusetts will agree that it was the general understanding in the committee that we would ask the House about this, and that in the meantime Mr. Weaver would have some idea about which ones need priority and which are important.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that we simply did not know where the money would be spent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the committee will take it back without any prejudice, and will try to have the study made, in order to distribute the \$450,000, I am perfectly willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator will come forward as an expert in regard to how he would spend the \$450,000 on the 11 projects, that would be extremely helpful.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot do it off-hand, but I think I can make some suggestions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLARK IN SUPPORT OF SENATOR SPARKMAN'S MOTION TO RESTORE FUNDS

I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Alabama and I join with him in urging that the Senate restore these funds.

The reason given for cutting these funds, which appears on page 20 of Senate Report No. 690, makes it obvious that the committee's action was based on either a misunderstanding or misinformation. The reason given was that, and I quote:

"Such studies by this Agency should await the completion of the investigation now being conducted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, after which the committee would be in a position to consider the funds needed for that purpose."

As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I can assure the Sen-

ate that that committee is not undertaking any such studies as the report refers to. I presume that the committee meant to refer to the Special Committee on Aging, rather than to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. If so, and speaking as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly of the Special Committee on Aging, I can also assure the Senate that our committee is also not engaged in carrying on the studies which the Housing and Home Finance Agency would be undertaking if the requested funds were made available.

As a matter of fact, of the 11 studies which HHFA would undertake if the funds were restored, only one is of direct concern to the Special Committee on Aging. None would seem to be of direct concern to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. All are of concern to the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency and as a member of that subcommittee, I thoroughly agree with its chairman, Senator SPARKMAN, that they should be made.

I should like to say a few words about that one proposed study which is definitely of interest to my Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly. That study, which will cost \$125,000, calls for a "Special Analysis of Census Data on Housing Conditions of the Elderly." It would be made, on contract, by the Bureau of the Census for the Agency—and, of course, would be available to the Congress.

Invaluable data on present housing conditions of the aged has been collected by the Bureau of the Census. That data, analysis of which will undoubtedly prove of great value to industry, to the Agency, to Senator Sparkman's subcommittee and to my subcommittee, will be wasted unless funds for the analysis are provided. Obviously this analysis is not a task for my subcommittee which has neither the funds nor the specialized personnel for such an undertaking. Nor is it a task for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The only logical group to undertake the analysis is the Bureau of the Census which will undertake it if the Housing and Home Finance Agency is given the funds with which to reimburse the Bureau.

Certainly the funds for all these studies, each of which is calculated to make our housing operations more efficient and more economical, should be restored. I hope the Senate will support Senator SPARKMAN in this matter.

(NOTE.—The 11 proposed studies, only the second of which is of direct concern to the Special Committee on Aging, are studies of—

(Family displacement by governmental action.

(Special analysis of census data on housing conditions of the elderly.

(Statistics on sales price and volume of new homes.

(Credit factors in mortgage foreclosures.

(Techniques of local evaluation of non-residential space.

(Intermunicipal approaches to planning and renewal.

(The creation of an effective housing rehabilitation industry.

(Standards of housing and neighborhood quality.

(The problems of adaptation of immigrants to urban life.

(The optimum size of water and sewer facilities.

(Open space and land reservation requirements).

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, a while ago, in speaking on my amendment, I mentioned that I had a statement on the need for the urban studies and housing research program. I ask unanimous consent that



the statement be printed as a part of my remarks at that time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**NEED FOR THE URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH PROGRAM**

The rate of homebuilding activity has been rising in 1961 to lead the economy out of a recession. We need better housing market information to help avoid the accumulation of large unsold inventories of homes which would be followed by a sharp decline in homebuilding and, subsequently, a drop in general economic activity, a pattern which developed after World War II.

In addition to its mortgage credit and homebuilding responsibilities, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has urban renewal, community facility, mass transportation assistance, and open space land acquisition assistance programs involving billions of dollars in Federal grants and loans. In order that these funds shall be used efficiently, there is a need for information to be used in the formulation of program policies. The type of information needed is not in the Agency's files. It is not available from the operating statistics of the Agency or from other sources. The only way the Agency can get the information it needs is by contracting with the Bureau of the Census, or other governmental or private agencies, for field surveys. The HHFA staff will then analyze this information and prepare reports for guidance of policymaking officials of HHFA and private homebuilders and building materials manufacturers.

The types of data and their use can be illustrated by reference to a few specific informational needs that would be fulfilled. There are indications that the severity of some of our recent housing slumps could have been greatly mitigated if there had been adequate information as to current housing market developments. For example, during the fourth quarter of 1960 the rate of housing starts was reaching a low point. At that time a publication of a local homebuilders association in San Antonio, Tex., after making a survey of the market, said "Generally, sales are still lagging with inventories and some houses have been on the market over a year." With more timely data as to changes in selling time for different price classes of homes, such situations, where completed homes remain unsold for over a year, probably would not develop.

In early 1958, when there was a homebuilding slump, reports from the field indicated that the demand for low-priced homes continued to be strong but a weakness had developed in the higher-priced brackets of the market. If builders could be advised of current differences in demand for houses in different price classes, production would be geared more to demand and large fluctuations in activity might be avoided. The type of information that is needed to show sales volume and time of sales by different home price classes could be obtained through information to be collected monthly by the Bureau of the Census under one of the proposed housing studies.

In recent years we have been experiencing thousand mortgaged homes was at 2.9, compared with a rate of 1.8 five years ago.

The Congress recently authorized the insurance of 35- and 40-year home mortgages which will enable more moderate-income families to buy homes. We have the responsibility to the consumers, however, to see that they do not take on commitments which they cannot meet. We need more information on the factors which have been leading to foreclosure in recent years. Although an analysis of foreclosed FHA cases

might provide some clues, the information available in the files is only as of the time that the mortgage was originated. To do this job properly, the agency has to arrange for interviews of families who have recently lost their homes through foreclosures. Furthermore, it is necessary to interview families and study the circumstances leading to foreclosure of conventionally financed mortgages, since these account for about three-fourths of new homes.

There is still a lack of information about the living arrangements, housing conditions and capabilities to pay for housing of families and individuals in the older age brackets. There are studies of the aged underway. Regardless of what studies may be underway, however, the information on housing and incomes of the aged that is embodied in the 1960 census is vital for programing housing for the elderly. This census information will never see the light of day unless HHFA (or some other Government agency) contracts to purchase these tabulations. There are three legislative programs for housing for the elderly—the HHFA direct loan program, FHA Section 231 mortgage insurance program, and public housing that is provided for the elderly. If activities under these programs are to be carried out in a rational manner, the Agency urgently needs these special tabulations from the 1960 census, for which no financing has been provided under the regular census program.

If the Congress is to obtain from the Housing Agency reliable estimates of the size of housing and urban renewal programs that are required, better methods must be developed to measure the standards of neighborhood and housing quality. For example, the 1960 census of housing has three categories of poor housing quality—dilapidated, deteriorating, not dilapidated or deteriorating but lacking complete plumbing facilities. A combination of fieldwork and staff analysis is necessary to develop better standards, including measures of neighborhood quality, so that urban renewal and housing needs can be measured with greater accuracy.

The Housing Act of 1961 authorized a \$500 million community facility loan program. The largest category of construction that will be financed under this program will be for sewer and water facilities. It is known that there are economies of size in building such plants. There is lacking, however, a technical manual or guidebook which would help communities decide upon the best sizes and most efficient types of plants that would be suitable for their localities to meet present and future needs. A study that would produce such a publication would be extremely valuable to the communities, would put the Federal loan funds to work in a more efficient manner, and would result in lower charges to consumers.

The above outlined studies that would be undertaken with the funds requested by HHFA would obtain needed data through Government agency and private statistical collections and compilations. The information would be analyzed by the HHFA staff, with some help from consultants, to meet the needs of policymaking Federal, State and local officials and of the private homebuilding industry.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I have an amendment along the same line. There was an indication on the part of the manager of the bill that he would accept this \$125,000 research item in the field of housing for the elderly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems to me that surely a priority would be granted for it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Therefore, Mr. President, I offer the amendment which

I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Let me say that the purpose of the amendment is to restore the language in lines 16 to 20, on page 31, as underlined in the copy of the bill I have sent to the desk, and to include the additional language set forth in that draft.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. What happened to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama withdrew his amendment.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, in line 16, it is proposed to insert:

**URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH**

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, \$125,000 for research in housing for the aged.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President. It is my recollection that at the time when the Special Committee on the Aged was established and when the justification for the appropriation was made before the Committee on Rules and Administration, the rather generous appropriation which was advanced for this special committee was based on the premise and the assumption that information would already be available from various other agencies. Nothing was said about any other appropriations to permit the other governmental agencies to provide information to this committee. The assumption was that this information was available, and that it was necessary only to have it expertly analyzed and to have the statistics worked out by the special committee itself.

Do I now correctly understand that this item proposes an appropriation of \$125,000 to collate all the other information? It was at least my opinion that it would be done by the Special Committee on the Aged.

Mr. McNAMARA. We have no staff to do this work. We rely on the statistics which were gathered by the Census Bureau on millions of cards.

Mr. MILLER. The \$150,000 provided for the Senator's committee would provide a very substantial staff; and the statement was made that the information could readily be obtained from the other departments, and would need only to be analyzed by the experts on the staff of the Senator's committee.

I cannot reconcile this amendment with the background of the Subcommittee on Aging, as I understood it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this bill as it passed the House provided for \$8,404,098,000. The Senate committee has increased the amount in the bill already by \$694,516,500.

The amount in this bill is over the appropriations for 1961, for the same agencies, by a total of \$605,071,100.

By numerous rollcalls and other efforts, the Senate has refused to reduce the amount provided in this bill by as much as one dime.



It is now proposed to increase it by another \$125,000 after all the other increases.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold it temporarily, and I again ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment, which would increase the appropriation another \$125,000. The bill already increases the amount appropriated for last year by \$605 million.

I think we should establish whether we are to hold the line. If we are to go forward in spending let us get on record.

I ask for the yeas and nays. If the yeas and nays are not ordered I will ask for a quorum. We shall get home sooner if the yeas and nays are ordered.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to accept the Senator's amendment in lieu of the present language of the bill. That would put this item in conference. The Senate committee fully intended to appropriate some money for some of these studies. That would put this item in conference, and I am perfectly willing to do that. The motion of the Senator from Delaware would strike that out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This is not my motion to strike it out. The committee has already struck it out, and I am trying to sustain the position of the committee to keep it stricken out. What the Senator is trying to do is increase the amount provided by his own bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Delaware knows that the chairmen of the Senate Appropriation Subcommittees do not try to increase their own bills. Nobody expects that a bill which comes to the Senate floor to be the same as the one reported by the committee. Many items cannot be considered in committee. Some items need another look. There are some items on which we do not agree with the House that necessitate conferences, such as this one.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senate has steadfastly refused to cut the appropriation. I think we should have a vote and let the taxpayers know with what they are confronted as the result of this loose-spending atmosphere.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is the motion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Michigan has offered an amendment to increase the appropriation by \$125,000 over the amount approved by the Senator's own committee. I think we should defeat his amendment. I think the Senate should sustain the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President I am glad the chairman of the subcommittee has agreed to take this amendment. The Appropriations Committees of both

Houses have shown a very real willingness to be economical. There was a budget request for \$900,000 with 11 objectives. I can tell by the smiles of Senators on both sides of the aisle that they all thought most of those objectives were not very practical.

We found the House had cut the amount from \$900,000 to \$450,000. We had no way in which to weigh the priority of the various proposals. The suggestion was made, "Let us cut it out; it will all be in conference."

The reason why I am glad the chairman has agreed to take this amendment—and I am glad the Senator from Michigan has made it—is that it will put the Senate on record as preferring this particular objective—that is, for housing for the elderly—ahead of the other objectives which Senators heard read. I think every Senator knows this is the most practical one of the items suggested.

In my own State numerous buildings are now being revamped into various types of housing for the aged. It is not public housing; it is housing for people who have limited incomes of \$200 or \$250 a month, or perhaps a little more. This kind of program is most practical.

I am glad the Senate is insisting on this program. If we adopt it, it will be because the Senate believes that, among the 11, this is the best proposal.

What will be in conference? Instead of arguing as between 0 and \$450,000, the range will be between \$125,000 and \$450,000, with one mandate, and that is to be sure to put in an item for research on housing for the elderly.

I think it would be fine to take this amendment to conference.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, my amendment would restore the sum of \$125,000. In explanation of this amendment, I should like to say that the Bureau of the Census, in developing the 1960 census, has collected an unparalleled mass of data bearing on the housing conditions under which our 16 million older people are now living.

Speaking as chairman of the Committee on Aging, I think it would be most important for the Congress, to State and local government, and to the housing industry, to have this data analyzed. That is what would occur if my amendment were adopted.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency would use this money to contract with the Bureau of the Census so that the Bureau could analyze its invaluable data on this subject and thereby provide a great service to all interested people. Certainly, this is not a task that could be undertaken by a committee of the Congress. It is a task that can and should be carried out by the Bureau of the Census. It would be a great waste if it were not undertaken. It will provide that sort of information which those in attendance at the White House Conference on Aging felt was essential if we are to cope with their problems intelligently and effectively. I hope my amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 19, as follows:

[No. 119]

YEAS—67

|               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Aiken         | Hartke       | Mundt          |
| Anderson      | Hickey       | Muskie         |
| Bartlett      | Hill         | Neuberger      |
| Beall         | Holland      | Pastore        |
| Bible         | Humphrey     | Pell           |
| Bridges       | Jackson      | Prouty         |
| Bush          | Javits       | Proxmire       |
| Byrd, W. Va.  | Johnston     | Randolph       |
| Cannon        | Jordan       | Saltonstall    |
| Carlson       | Keating      | Schoeppel      |
| Carroll       | Kuchel       | Scott          |
| Case, N.J.    | Lausche      | Smathers       |
| Case, S. Dak. | Long, Mo.    | Smith, Mass.   |
| Church        | Long, Hawaii | Smith, Maine   |
| Clark         | Long, La.    | Sparkman       |
| Dodd          | Magnuson     | Stennis        |
| Douglas       | Mansfield    | Symington      |
| Engle         | McGee        | Wiley          |
| Ervin         | McNamara     | Williams, N.J. |
| Fong          | Metcalf      | Young, N. Dak. |
| Fulbright     | Monroney     | Young, Ohio    |
| Gruening      | Morse        |                |
| Hart          | Moss         |                |

NAYS—19

|           |          |              |
|-----------|----------|--------------|
| Bennett   | Curtis   | Goldwater    |
| Boggs     | Dworshak | Hickenlooper |
| Byrd, Va. | Eastland | McClellan    |
| Cotton    | Ellender | Miller       |



|                                |                      |                         |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Morton<br>Robertson<br>Russell | Talmadge<br>Thurmond | Tower<br>Williams, Del. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|

## NOT VOTING—14

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Allott<br>Burdick<br>Butler<br>Capehart<br>Chavez | Cooper<br>Dirksen<br>Gore<br>Hayden<br>Hruska | Kefauver<br>Kerr<br>McCarthy<br>Yarborough |
|---|---|--|

So Mr. McNAMARA's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$194,456,500" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$171,-508,500".

On page 19, it is proposed to strike out line 18.

On page 20, it is proposed to strike out lines 11 and 12.

On page 20, it is proposed to strike out line 13.

On page 20, it is proposed to strike out lines 15 and 16.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment would strike out four projects which were not requested by the administration.

The first relates to the post office building at Tupelo, Miss., in the amount of \$789,000.

The second relates to the Federal office building, Pittsburgh, Pa., in the amount of \$20 million.

The third relates to the post office building at Dyersburg, Tenn., in the amount of \$901,000.

The fourth relates to the post office and courthouse at Montpelier, Vt., \$1,258,000.

This represents a total saving of \$22,-948,000.

I make it clear that the reason I offer the amendment is that I feel very strongly at this time, under these circumstances, the Congress should stay within the request of the President. I think the Kennedy administration has been very generous and considerate in moving ahead on all fronts, and particularly on the building front.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Have these four projects been passed upon by the Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. They have, indeed. They have all been authorized by the Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate, along with many other projects.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the projects were approved by the Committees on Public Works, why were they not included in the budget estimates?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator knows that many projects approved by the Committees on Public Works are

not included. I have a list of approximately 25 projects, totaling \$327 million. The only ones included are the ones listed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not quite understand. Were these General Services Administration projects or post office projects?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The General Services Administration builds them, but they are post offices and Federal office buildings.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They are combined projects?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, until the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, explains his position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Washington yield himself?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The total for all building projects in the United States was \$194,456,500. The House made three changes. It added \$5 million to a new New York project. It left out the GSA depot in Denver, and added \$2 million for a customs facility at Long Beach, Calif. As a result of the House action, the total was \$171 million, approximately \$10 million below the budget estimate.

The Senate committee restored the Denver depot and authorized \$5,600,000 to be reappropriated for the abandoned Philadelphia project. The committee then added four additional projects showing construction award capability in the calendar year 1961.

The reason the four projects were added is that it was intended that they be built in this year. We would not save any money by delaying. If the projects were on next year's priority list, so-called, we tried to schedule them out. Sometimes the House adds some projects, sometimes we add some.

The post office building at Tupelo, Miss., showing construction capability for October, 2½ months from now, could be started.

The Pittsburgh, Pa., Federal office building has been ready to go for quite a few weeks.

The proposed post office building at Dyersburg, Tenn., will be ready to go November 1.

The proposed post office and courthouse at Montpelier, Vt., will be ready to go in December.

The committee selected projects which were ready to go, and for which we have had the sites and expenses for planning, and construction capability to go this fall. We took four such projects and added them to the bill. That is the basis of the request.

I wish to point out that the next project in mind is one in the State of Washington in March 1962. But that project can be handled in next year's budget. All of the projects have been authorized, and I state to Senators that all of these projects have been au-

thorized in the way we have always operated with respect to public building appropriations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In support of the chairman of the committee I wish to state that we made the cutoff date December 31, 1961. We selected the building projects that were ready to start, and those on which plans, sites, and everything else had been carried forward for this year.

The Senator from Washington has mentioned the project proposed in the State of Washington, which was ready to start next March. That project was cut out. We said, "If anything is put in the bill for next year we will run into problems." So we made the cutoff date December 31, 1961, and included in the bill everything that was ready to go up to that time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There were 28 additional projects that had a construction capability in 1962. The House committee said that the projects would be included next year. We are selecting the four projects because we think we can save money by undertaking them now. At any rate, we shall go ahead if we start now. In the big Pittsburgh project we must go ahead. It has been inactive for 9 weeks, while everything in connection with the project is complete.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, are fallout shelters included in the project?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee decided that it would not include fallout shelters, which would represent less than 5 percent of the cost in this case, but the appropriation would include the basic structure of the buildings so that if we should decide to construct the fallout shelters, all the details necessary would be available. The estimates are based on the basic structure, which would be available for fallout shelters.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer is that my amendment does not touch the question of fallout shelters. It would leave the project in the way the committee recommended it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is not clear to me why the projects, if they passed the same tests required of other projects in the bill, did not include such shelters in the budget recommendations. I do not see any particular reason for discriminating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. Unanimous consent would be required to extend the debate.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from



Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 120]

YEAS—17

|            |              |                |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| Beall      | Douglas      | Morton         |
| Boggs      | Dworshak     | Proxmire       |
| Bush       | Goldwater    | Tower          |
| Case, N.J. | Hickenlooper | Wiley          |
| Church     | Keating      | Williams, Del. |
| Curtis     | Miller       |                |

NAYS—68

|              |               |           |
|--------------|---------------|-----------|
| Aiken        | Carroll       | Fulbright |
| Anderson     | Case, S. Dak. | Gruening  |
| Bartlett     | Clark         | Hart      |
| Bennett      | Cotton        | Hartke    |
| Bible        | Dodd          | Hickey    |
| Bridges      | Eastland      | Hill      |
| Byrd, Va.    | Ellender      | Holland   |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Engle         | Humphrey  |
| Cannon       | Ervin         | Jackson   |
| Carlson      | Fong          | Javits    |

Johnston  
Jordan  
Kuchel  
Lausche  
Long, Mo.  
Long, Hawaii  
Long, La.  
Magnuson  
Mansfield  
McClellan  
McGee  
McNamara  
Metcalf

Monroney  
Morse  
Moss  
Mundt  
Muskie  
Pastore  
Pell  
Prouty  
Randolph  
Robertson  
Russell  
Saltonstall  
Schoepfel

Scott  
Smathers  
Smith, Mass.  
Smith, Maine  
Sparkman  
Stennis  
Symington  
Talmadge  
Thurmond  
Williams, N.J.  
Young, N. Dak.  
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Allott  
Burdick  
Butler  
Capehart  
Chavez

Cooper  
Dirksen  
Gore  
Hayden  
Hruska

Kefauver  
Kerr  
McCarthy  
Neuberger  
Yarborough

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer my last amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of it be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUSH. May we have the amendment identified?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amendment has not been printed. It occurs on page 38, line 7, where I would strike out "\$47,053,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38,053,000."

Also, on page 38, line 8, I would strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22,000,000," which amount is included in the bigger figure.

What the amendment does is to reduce the Appropriations Committee's request for medical research funds for the Veterans' Administration from the committee's request to the budget estimate.

I believe this is the most logical and appealing amendment I have offered today. It would save \$10 million. It saves \$10 million in a program which is duplicated elsewhere.

The fact is that after the House increased the funds by \$5 million over the budget request, the Veterans' Administration said that the budget request of \$22 million, to which I would reduce the committee figure, represented an increase of \$500,000 over the amount available for fiscal 1961. This request reflected the judgment of the President as to the needs of the Veterans' Administration for an overall, balanced medical research program for the entire Government.

The fact is that to a small extent the VA duplicates the work of the National Institutes of Health.

Tomorrow there will be before the Senate the HEW appropriation bill, which increases the research funds for cancer by \$42 million, and for heart disease by \$63 million. This would increase the funds for research and allied fields by over \$10 million.

The President of the United States and his administration obviously are in the best position to coordinate the program. The original budget request would permit an adequate, overall, bal-

anced program. It seems to me that this reason makes sense. If we are to economize anywhere, we should economize in this area.

Medical research is very popular, and it is easy to vote against cancer. However, it is irresponsible to vote other than for what the administration has requested, particularly in view of the very generous recommendations that are coming before the Senate in the bill which we shall consider tomorrow.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I understand the Senator to say that his amendment would reduce the figure by \$10 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. From \$47,053,000 to what figure?

Mr. PROXMIRE. From \$47,053,000 to \$37,053,000. In order to do that I must make two changes in the bill, one in line 7, page 38, and the second in line 8 of page 38.

Mr. BRIDGES. Line 8 is a part of line 7, is it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct, but it is necessary to change it in both places.

Mr. BRIDGES. They do not add up to a saving of \$10 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is a saving of \$10 million, but it must be repeated in both places to make the bill consistent.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. What do the committee hearings themselves reflect as to why the committee provided the additional \$10 million?

Mr. PROXMIRE. My time is limited. I shall ask the Senator from Washington to answer the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have only 5 minutes.

The Senator from Wisconsin said that the result would be a sizable saving. It is just the reverse. The appropriation of this money would return more to the Treasury of the United States, through veterans' medical research and the continuation of the program, than any other single item on which we can figure a dollars and cents return.

The veterans' hospital bill this year will be \$987 million. Next year, because of the advancing age of veterans, the cost will go well over a billion dollars. This amount is for in-and-out veterans' hospital care.

The only way we can hope to hold the amount down is to do the kind of research that will accomplish the things which need to be done in veterans' hospitals. Every other bed has a mental case in veterans' hospitals today. In that field alone, the cost is well over \$341 million. Some research will reduce that figure, to say nothing of alleviating the untold human suffering.

The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin proposes the worst kind of economy, because we forced some of this over the budget. About 7 years ago we found we were about to close the TB wards in 170-some veterans' hospitals, because there were not enough patients after we had done research. We could show a saving in that item of \$150 million alone.



This is a piddling amount when we consider that the total amount of the bill is \$1 billion, and the total veterans' bill in this appropriation is just under \$5 billion. This amount is about 3 percent.

The medical staff at the Veterans' Administration sometimes does not ask for too much; but it is not a duplication of what the Senator from Alabama has referred to, by one iota. It is supplemental, because the greatest laboratory of medical research in the world is in the 173 veterans' hospitals. This is the place where a record can be kept of every disease and every patient. It is known exactly what happens to them.

This is the best purpose for which we have ever spent money. A part of this program is \$2 million extra for laboratory equipment. If Senators do not believe it is needed, let them visit the veterans' hospitals in their own areas and look at the old, antique laboratories.

In the bill—no one has said a word about it—is \$1,749,543,000 as the start of a \$20 billion investment to go to the moon. That is all right. But when it comes to savings, where can we show such savings in terms of dollars and cents, let alone the human suffering involved? I think the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin is penny wise and pound foolish.

This estimate is cut from what a very substantial group of top medical experts in the United States agreed, in the veterans' field alone, would be a minimal program. It is a small amount when we consider that we shall spend \$1 billion this year alone for veterans. If this research would do something to benefit the mental cases—and we are making progress in the field of tranquilizers—we would save that much in one fell swoop in 1 week. Every other bed in a veterans' hospital has a mental case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senate will not accept the amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute remains.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Am I correct in my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would give the administration all the money in this field that the administration has asked for?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Missouri is 100 percent correct. I think every Senator knows that former Senator John F. Kennedy was a real champion in this field. He served on the committee of the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

The President of the United States feels very deeply about this kind of proposal. It is the judgment of the administration that this amount is all that can be usefully disposed of. Under the circumstances, it seems to me we should follow their advice.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have been trying for 10 minutes to have some Senator to yield time to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator wishes to ask me a question, I shall try to answer it in my remaining time.

Mr. CARROLL. Is there justification for \$2 million for laboratory facilities?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Not in my judgment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the amendment presented strike or change the figures in the bill in two places?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I ask that the amendment be read, because it does not do any such thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$32 million" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22 million."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota. The page did not take both parts of the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the other part of the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$47,053,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,053,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Senate about to vote on both items, line 7 and line 8?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is one amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The last statement by the clerk does not conform with what the Senator from Wisconsin said was his proposal. I understand that he is proposing to reduce the item of \$47,053,000 to \$37,053,000, and the item of \$32 million to \$22 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is that the way in which the amendment was read in the first instance, before the yeas and nays were called for?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Was the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was read.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota would like to know what the Senate is about to vote on. I understood, in the first place, that after the clerk began to read the amendment, the reading was dispensed with.

The Senator from South Dakota went to the desk to find out what the amendment was. I did this because the discussion related to a \$10 million change, but the figures in the bill indicated only a \$7 million difference between the overall House and Senate figures.

The amendment at the desk proposed to change "\$32,000,000" to "\$22,000,000", but did not refer to the reduction in the \$47 million figure. The other part of the amendment was not there. It was never read. The yeas and nays were ordered on the proposal to change "\$32,000,000" to "\$22,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the entire amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22,000,000".

On page 38, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$47,053,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,053,000".

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for a division on the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin strikes \$10 million from the \$47,053,000, which is the part of the bill that deals with all medical, administration, and miscellaneous operating expenses, not only with the research; is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the amendment I offered would reduce the appropriation from \$47,053,000 to \$37,053,000, and from \$32 million to \$22 million, the reason for that being that the \$32 million is included in the \$47,053,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is one amendment. It is consistent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has asked for a division.

Mr. BUSH. How can the question be divided?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was presented on two separate sheets of paper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota insist upon a division?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota does.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has asked that the amendment be divided. Does he insist upon having the amendment divided?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It relates to two separate items on two separate lines.

Mr. CURTIS. But how many items of the bill are we asked to change by means of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two.

Mr. CURTIS. Which one are we about to vote on?



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two separate amounts affected by the same item.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask that before each vote is taken, the amendment on which the vote is to be taken be stated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is not the situation as follows: The total sum of money under the item "Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses" is \$47,053,000. Of that amount, in the same bill \$32 million is earmarked for research. The intention of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is to reduce the research funds by \$10 million. Therefore both the \$47,053,000 and the \$32 million in that item must be reduced in accordance with the purpose of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair, although such is not necessarily the case.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And therefore they are inseparable, if the proposed \$10 million reduction in the research funds is to be made. Therefore, let us vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, has not the Chair already ruled that the question is divisible?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the Chair that this is a very dangerous precedent; this will happen round after round, under hundreds of items in such bills, if the Senate establishes a precedent that every time a dollar sign is used, there can be a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota withdraw his request?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, Mr. President, for there will be no dangerous precedent. This procedure has been followed time after time before, so far as that is concerned.

I am not particularly wedded to this procedure, insofar as the amount is concerned; but I think I have demonstrated that a misstatement was made in regard to the pending amendment. Only one amendment was pending, and it related to a proposed reduction of the funds for research, and did not involve a reduction of the total amount of funds proposed to be appropriated.

The fact that the question is divisible is evidenced by the fact that the amendment was originally written as two amendments, on two separate pieces of paper. This division is one of substance, and is not purely technical. The House language would have left \$17 million for nonresearch purposes. The Senate language would allow only \$15 million. The two amendments affect that situation.

Mr. ANDERSON. But we waived our rights on that score when we took the amendments and did not ask to have them stated separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is requested.

The question now is on agreeing to the first part of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr.

BURDICK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 121]

YEAS—23

Bartlett  
Bush  
Byrd, Va.  
Case, N.J.  
Curtis  
Douglas  
Ellender  
Fulbright

Goldwater  
Hickenlooper  
Javits  
Keating  
Lausche  
McClellan  
Miller  
Morton

Proxmire  
Robertson  
Symington  
Thurmond  
Tower  
Williams, Del.  
Young, Ohio

NAYS—60

Aiken  
Anderson  
Beall  
Bennett  
Bible  
Boggs  
Bridges  
Byrd, W. Va.  
Cannon  
Carlson  
Carroll  
Case, S. Dak.

Church  
Clark  
Cotton  
Dodd  
Dworshak  
Eastland  
Engle  
Ervin  
Fong  
Gruening  
Hart  
Hartke

Hickey  
Hill  
Holland  
Humphrey  
Jackson  
Johnston  
Jordan  
Kuchel  
Long, Mo.  
Long, Hawaii  
Long, La.  
Magnuson

Mansfield  
McGee  
McNamara  
Metcalf  
Monroney  
Morse  
Moss  
Mundt

Muskie  
Pastore  
Pell  
Prouty  
Randolph  
Russell  
Schoeppel  
Scott

Smathers  
Smith, Mass.  
Smith, Maine  
Sparkman  
Stennis  
Talmadge  
Williams, N.J.  
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Allott  
Burdick  
Butler  
Capehart  
Chavez  
Cooper

Dirksen  
Gore  
Hayden  
Hruska  
Kefauver  
Kerr

McCarthy  
Neuberger  
Saltonstall  
Wiley  
Yarborough

So the first part of Mr. PROXMIER'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I intend, in a moment, to ask that the order for the yeas and nays on the other part of the amendment be rescinded. Before I do so, however, I should like to make this statement so that Senators may be sure that this is a divisible question. It would have been perfectly possible for the bill to have stood at \$47,053,000 for the total purposes, but for the Senate to have reduced from \$32 million to \$22 million the amount that would have been available for medical research. But the total sum could have stood at \$47,053,000. So it was perfectly obvious that it was a divisible question. When a question like this occurs, the yeas and nays having been ordered, my understanding is that the division automatically extends the yeas and nays to the other part of the amendment. However, the Senate has by record vote maintained the \$47,053,000. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on the other part of the amendment be rescinded.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. Which part of the amendment did the Senate vote on—the portion which was read first by the reading clerk, or the portion which appears first in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote was on the first amount that appears in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. And not the amendment that was read first.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Either way, if either figure was sustained, the other figure would be sustained.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as I recall, only one order for a yea-and-nay vote was entered. Are the yeas and nays ordered on the second amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule is that where there is a division of the amendment, the yeas and nays ordered must be taken on each branch.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has a ruling been made on the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? Without objection, the order for the yeas and nays is recalled.



The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, on line 8, page 38.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the report of the committee, which shows that the bill as passed by the Senate exceeds last year's appropriation by \$605,071,100.

I also call special attention to the fact that after attempts to cut the appropriation failed, the bill passed the Senate in an amount \$125,000 more than was reported by committee.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Amount of bill as passed House-----                  | \$8,404,098,000 |
| Amount of increase by Senate-----                    | 694,516,500     |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate---              | 9,098,614,500   |
| Amount of appropriations, 1961-----                  | 8,493,543,400   |
| Amount of regular and supplemental estimates, 1962-- | 9,174,561,000   |
| The bill as reported to the Senate:                  |                 |
| Under the estimates for 1962-----                    | 75,946,500      |
| Over the appropriations for 1961-----                | 605,071,100     |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 7445) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 591, H.R. 7035.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the majority leader has informed me that the Senate, when it completes its business, will adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, under the previous order.

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER RELATING TO DISCUSSIONS WITH SOVIET UNION ON BERLIN ISSUE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] was not able to be in the Senate today, and on his behalf I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD a statement which he has prepared on the question of preparation for discussions with the Soviet Union on the Berlin issue.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

In an article by James Reston, which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, July 30, 1961, Mr. Reston suggested that Secretary of State Rusk had a unique opportunity, and indeed a responsibility, to use the talents of many well-informed men in finding a political answer to the Berlin problem. He mentioned, among others, Mr. John J. McCloy, former Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson, Mr. George F. Kennan, Mr. David Bruce, Mr. Robert Lovett, Gens. Lucius Clay, Walter Bedell Smith and Maxwell Taylor, and former Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy.

On June 21, July 5, and July 14, 1961, I made statements in the Senate, suggesting that the President and Secretary of State Rusk call into consultation men who have had direct experience with the Berlin problem, and named among those who should be consulted Mr. McCloy, Mr. Acheson, Mr. Kennan, Mr. Bruce, General Clay, and Mr. Murphy, as well as Mr. Charles Bohlen, Mr. Llewellyn Thompson, Dr. Conant, and former Secretary of State Christian Herter.

I said in the Senate that advising with these men and others would accomplish three definite purposes. It would:

1. Provide the President and Secretary of State the best knowledge and experience available upon the issues of Germany and Berlin—from men who have practical experience in facing these issues, and who have political judgment.
2. Give confidence to the Nation and the Congress that these issues are receiving the fullest and best consideration.
3. Provide for the President the broadest base of support for the decisions he will be

required to make regarding Berlin and Germany.

The President of the United States made a strong statement last week on the Berlin problem—one of his best, and one which I know has the support of all of us and of the country. It set out clearly our positions in Berlin which are nonnegotiable, and which we are determined to uphold at all costs. But it did not, and perhaps could not at this time, speak of those matters which could be the subject of negotiation with the Soviet Union.

The determination of these matters and the preparation for discussions with the Soviet Union is now our task. We are accustomed to thinking that if Mr. Khrushchev should make a treaty with East Germany it will not occur until the end of this year. There is nothing to guarantee this, for if he desires he could make such a treaty before that time. It is, therefore, imperative that our country and its allies prepare their position upon which talks can be held with the Soviet Union.

Some weeks ago, on June 23, Mr. Arthur Krock of the New York Times called attention to the suggestion I had made for consultation with men who have had wide experience with the problems of Berlin. I am very happy that Mr. Reston, who is one of our most respected writers, also approves this idea.

[From the New York Times, July 30, 1961]

#### RUSK ON THE SPOT IN THE BERLIN PLANNING (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 29.—The burden of finding a political answer to the Berlin problem is now falling heavily on Secretary of State Rusk.

It is his responsibility to gather the talents available to him and concentrate during these coming weeks on this critical point.

No government in the world today has more well-informed men available to it on this subject. Maxwell Taylor is a former U.S. commanding general in Germany. John J. McCloy was former U.S. high commissioner there. Dean G. Acheson was Secretary of State when the last major Berlin crisis was resolved. George F. Kennan, the Ambassador in Yugoslavia, and David Bruce, the Ambassador in Britain, have long experience in Germany.

Outside the Government are Robert Lovett, Generals Lucius Clay and Walter Bedell Smith, and former Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy, all of whom have been deeply involved in the problem in the past. Yet while some of these men are actively engaged in the search for new approaches there is still no evidence that Secretary Rusk has been finding out whether the rest of them have any constructive new ideas.

In the last few weeks, the dominant personalities in the Berlin planning have been Acheson, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and General Taylor. They have been preoccupied quite naturally with gathering the military strength that makes effective political negotiation possible, but the problem now is to devise a political program that can be negotiated behind the military shield.

#### POLICY OF DISPERSAL

The State Department's role in all this planning in the past has been odd. Mr. Rusk has, of course, been involved, but he has not been the central figure, and his principal aids have been dispersed.

The head of the Department's policy planning staff, George McGhee, has been away in the Greek islands for weeks. Under Secretary of State Bowles is off in Cyprus. Though the United Nations is now engaged in a critical debate, Adlai E. Stevenson is off in Europe. Thus, when Mr. Rusk goes



to Paris next week to start talking to the British, French, and German foreign secretaries about Berlin, the State Department will be in the hands of Alexis Johnson, a deputy under secretary for political affairs, and Mr. Rusk will be starting his talks with the allies before the administration has any clear idea of what it wishes to propose.

The liveliest minds and most commanding figures have not been in the State Department.

Even some of the best minds in the Department have either not been brought in on the German problem or have been brought into the discussions late and then dropped out of the discussions just as abruptly.

Accordingly, Berlin is a test not only of the Department of State but of the Secretary of State himself. He is well liked in Washington and respected by the President. He is working harder than almost any other official in the Government, and he has the confidence of those members of the diplomatic corps who have had an opportunity to talk to him at any length on fundamental problems.

#### THE MAGICIAN

There is, however, a strong feeling here that he is not as effective or as resourceful in pressing the case for political solutions of problems as others in the Government who are concentrating on the military aspects of these same questions.

His performance is vague and, so far as the public is concerned, episodic. He appears and disappears on the Washington stage like the old vaudeville actor trying to get out of a straitjacket. The curtain suddenly parts and there he is struggling manfully to get out. Then the curtain closes, other actors take over, and just when you've forgotten all about him, he suddenly appears again in an even more frenzied tangle.

All Secretaries of State have had to go through the same torture, and not being magicians, they have all in the end had to get help to break loose. Mr. Rusk's problem is that he does not like some of the help he has and isn't using some of the help he likes.

Fortunately, there is still time to mobilize the talent available to the Department of State. Maybe all these experts on Germany, from McCloy and Bruce to Kennan, Bohlen, and Lovett, have nothing to add to the long search for a Berlin formula, but nobody is going to know unless their ideas are sought.

#### PRESERVATION OF WISCONSIN'S NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the New York Times, of Sunday, July 30, on the excellent program initiated by the Governor of Wisconsin, Gaylord Nelson, to preserve Wisconsin's natural resources.

This is truly one of the finest conservation programs any State has had in the last 50 years.

Wisconsin has led the way often in the past in legislation that would benefit all the people, not just special interest. Once again we are proud of the fact that in our fine Governor, Gaylord Nelson, we have a champion of the public interest, one who has been successful in setting up a long-range program to safeguard our vast but endangered natural resources for posterity. Wisconsin takes great pride in the beauty of its scenic outdoors. This significant program for permanent preservation

can be a blueprint for other States to do the same.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD as this point.

There being no objection, the article is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE WISCONSIN PLAN

Urban growth and population pressure are fast eating up land and destroying outdoor recreational resources. More cars, more boats, more leisure for more people overcrowd and even spoil camping and recreational areas. Drainage, dredging, and pollution are ruining wetlands, the breeding grounds for game birds and wildlife. Game fish and fishing grounds are diminishing. Scenic spots are being wrecked by roadside slums, billboards, and commercial uses. The public is fast losing access to many lakes and streams as private owners take over shorelines.

Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, has proposed that his State spend \$50 million in the next decade to safeguard "our vast but endangered outdoor resources." Most of the money would go "to securing for the public these vital assets that are fast disappearing." He would buy large areas to preserve them. Little money would be spent initially for development. The Wisconsin Assembly has overwhelmingly approved his proposal, and the State Senate is expected to do so shortly.

The Wisconsin plan has targets similar to those approved overwhelmingly by New York State voters at the polls in 1960, when they authorized Governor Rockefeller and the legislature to borrow \$75 million to buy 25,000 acres to be added to existing parks and to create new parks. But it is considerably broader and more flexible.

A key proposal in the Wisconsin plan is that the State undertake an extensive program for acquiring scenic and other easements. Property owners would lease scenic spots through agreements allowing them to continue using their land for any purpose which did not destroy esthetic resources. Easements would also be sought for public hunting and fishing rights, fence-row rights to provide game cover and overlook rights along lakes and rivers. Wisconsin has already used the easement plan to preserve scenic values along the Great River Road that follows the Mississippi River.

Wisconsin is a recreation-minded State proud of its outdoor resources. It learned, more than 75 years ago, in the days of the timber barons, how easily they can be lost. Most States already have had similar lessons; but few are doing as much as Wisconsin has been doing to profit, from them.

#### FORESTRY PROBLEMS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, several months ago Mr. R. Nelson Nash, a registered forester of Smithfield, N.C., made available to me a memorandum which he had prepared on the subject of the program of the Forest Service. I was tremendously impressed with the ingenuity of Mr. Nash, an independent businessman, in his efforts to compete effectively with the Federal Government in the field of forestry. Mr. Nash epitomizes the free enterprise stalwart and he has shown how, through perseverance and offering an effective timber management program, a small businessman can be successful in this field in spite of a vast and comprehensive federal program.

Mr. Nash's views are consonant with a very large segment of our business community which feels that the Government is unduly competing with private enterprise. Especially, I should imagine that his statement reflects the thinking of many independent businessmen engaged in forestry management.

It is not surprising that Mr. Nash's successful business operation should capture the imagination of others, and therefore it was not unexpected when Nation's Business, in its June issue, published an article concerning Mr. Nash's activities. It appears that the article correctly portrays Mr. Nash as the independent businessman he is. However, in fairness to the Forest Service, I feel that I should say that it maintains that Nation's Business does not correctly describe its program. Even so, I feel that that part of the article dealing with the position taken by Mr. Nash and his success in this field are worthy of consideration by the Members of Congress.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Pattern for Federal Takeover of Your Business," which appeared in the June 1961 issue of the Nation's Business, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PATTERN FOR FEDERAL TAKEOVER OF YOUR BUSINESS

A massive new program of federally forced growth is being prepared in Washington.

Government planners have set long-range production goals for one of the Nation's most vital natural resources. Officials are now detailing specific methods by which extensive subsidies and complicated controls could be applied to spur citizens throughout the country to meet a supposed need in the far away year 2000.

It is a classic proposal for centralized planning and regimentation of a sector of our economy. It shows the bureaucratic approach to a real or imagined national problem. Just as in such fields as education, medical care, unemployment or housing, subsidies to buy solutions inevitably carry with them certain controls over those subsidized.

Involved in the new proposal for forced growth are about 4.5 million owners of 260 million acres of farm woodlots and other small, privately owned forest lands. According to the Federal plan, these private woodland owners are supposed to help close a timber gap that Federal officials believe may be upon us in a generation or two unless Uncle Sam steps in.

Forest industry people insist a crash Federal program for growth is unnecessary and would discourage private forestry progress now under way free of subsidies and controls.

Typical of the independent and progressive businessmen who oppose the Federal proposals is R. Nelson Nash, who heads Carolina Timber Management Co., Inc., a small consulting firm which manages about 25,000 acres of woodlands in eastern North Carolina.

Mr. Nash, a graduate forester, realizes that better forestry practices are needed on small woodlots. But, as he told Nation's Business:

"My objection to Government assistance programs is that they are impersonal and national in scope. The uniform standards and regulations cannot possibly take into account the many individual needs, preferences, and circumstances of forest owners."



87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 7445

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 31, 1961

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4      in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry in-  
5      dependent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpo-  
6      rations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June  
7      30, 1962, namely:

1 TITLE I  
2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
3 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL  
4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics  
6 and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National  
7 Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C.  
8 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reim-  
9 bursement of the General Services Administration for se-  
10 curity guard services, and services as authorized by section  
11 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at  
12 rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem, \$320,000.

13 OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE  
14 MOBILIZATION  
15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and De-  
17 fense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section  
18 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; reimburse-  
19 ment of the General Services Administration for security  
20 guard services; ~~(1)~~*purchase of one passenger motor vehicle*  
21 *at not to exceed \$6,000*; expenses of attendance of cooperat-  
22 ing officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil  
23 defense and defense mobilization functions; not to exceed  
24 ~~(2)\$3,000~~ \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary ex-  
25 penses to be expended under the direction of the Director



1 for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination  
 2 thereon shall be final and conclusive; and not to exceed  
 3 \$900,000 for expenses of travel~~(3)~~, *excluding rental passen-*  
 4 *ger motor vehicles from General Services Administration;*  
 5 \$25,000,000: *Provided, (4)*That the foregoing amount shall  
 6 be available for not to exceed ~~303~~ positions in the District  
 7 of Columbia area: *Provided further,* That contracts for not to  
 8 exceed two persons under this appropriation for temporary or  
 9 intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act  
 10 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed an-  
 11 nually, and one such contract, for the services of an expert or  
 12 consultant for telecommunications, may provide for a per  
 13 diem rate of not to exceed \$75.

#### 14 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS 15 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

16 For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies  
 17 to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization func-  
 18 tions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense  
 19 Mobilization, including payments by the Department of  
 20 Labor to State employment security agencies for the full  
 21 cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization ac-  
 22 tivities, ~~(5)\$6,567,000~~ \$5,000,000.

#### 23 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

24 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense  
 25 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,

1 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds, \$22,-  
2 000,000, of which not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be avail-  
3 able for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of  
4 said Act.

5                   EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

6           For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,  
7 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense  
8 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of  
9 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,  
10 ~~(6)\$21,600,000~~ \$38,500,000.

11                   RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

12           For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
13 studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil  
14 defense and defense mobilization, including evacuation, shel-  
15 ter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by  
16 section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,  
17 as amended, and other law, including services as authorized  
18 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
19 ~~(7)\$1,500,000~~ \$2,500,000, to remain available until  
20 expended.

21                   CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

22           For expenses necessary for the design, construction, and  
23 equipment of protected regional facilities for the Office of  
24 Civil and Defense Mobilization, \$2,500,000, to remain avail-  
25 able until expended.



## GENERAL PROVISION

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

## FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

## DISASTER RELIEF

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem; \$8,900,000.

1 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
2 AUTHORIZATION)

3 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-  
4 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board  
5 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49  
6 U.S.C. 1376) , as is payable by the Board, (8)\$74,800,000  
7 \$81,700,000, of which not to exceed (9)\$5,000,000  
8 \$6,900,000 shall be available for subsidy for helicopter op-  
9 erations during the current fiscal year, to remain available  
10 until expended.

11 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses, including services as authorized  
14 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C.  
15 55a) ; not to exceed \$10,000 for medical examinations per-  
16 formed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; pay-  
17 ment in advance for library membership in societies whose  
18 publications are available to members only or to members  
19 at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed  
20 \$83,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Com-  
21 mission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reim-  
22 bursement of the General Services Administration for  
23 security guard services for protection of confidential files;  
24 and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial services by contract,  
25 without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as



1 amended; ~~(10)\$21,029,000~~ \$21,669,000: *Provided*, That  
 2 no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career  
 3 Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of  
 4 March 4, 1958, as amended.

5 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil  
 6 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and  
 7 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and  
 8 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established  
 9 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

10 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR  
 11 EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

12 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Ex-  
 13 ecutive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,  
 14 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary  
 15 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of  
 16 other international organizations, certain information con-  
 17 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered  
 18 for employment by such organizations, including services  
 19 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
 20 U.S.C. 55a), \$430,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation  
 21 shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the  
 22 applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Com-  
 23 mission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses  
 24 incurred by such agencies under said Executive order:  
 25 *Provided further*, That members of the International Organ-

1 izations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual trans-  
2 portation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence au-  
3 thorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,  
4 while traveling on official business away from their homes  
5 or regular places of business, including periods while en  
6 route to and from and at the place where their services are  
7 to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections  
8 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section  
9 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed  
10 to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time  
11 or intermittent service as a member of the International Or-  
12 ganizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service  
13 Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated  
14 January 9, 1953, as amended.

15 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

16 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May  
17 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of  
18 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),  
19 \$2,248,000.

20 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

21 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

22 For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund"  
23 of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as  
24 authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health



1 Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$4,500,000, to remain avail-  
 2 able until expended.

3 GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION, RETIRED EMPLOYEES  
 4 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

5 For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits  
 6 fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired  
 7 employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal  
 8 Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850),  
 9 \$19,000,000.

10 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND  
 11 DISABILITY FUND

12 For financing the annuity benefits and increases provided  
 13 by the Act of June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$44,637,000,  
 14 to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability  
 15 fund(11): *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission shall  
 16 include annually, in its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget,  
 17 estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the  
 18 civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts  
 19 paid out of the fund by reason of the enactment of Public  
 20 Law 85-465, and the Bureau of the Budget shall submit an-  
 21 nually to the Congress estimates of the appropriations neces-  
 22 sary to reimburse the fund for such amounts.

1   LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES  
2                                   HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

3           Not to exceed ~~(12)\$1,000,000~~ \$1,148,000 of the funds  
4   in the “Employees health benefits fund” shall be available for  
5   reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for adminis-  
6   trative expenses incurred by the Commission during the  
7   current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal  
8   Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 713),  
9   including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
10   August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

11   LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES  
12                                   LIFE INSURANCE FUND

13           Not to exceed \$260,000 of the funds in the “Employees  
14   life insurance fund” shall be available for reimbursement to  
15   the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses  
16   incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year  
17   in the administration of the Federal Employees’ Group Life  
18   Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103),  
19   including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act  
20   of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) : *Provided*, That this  
21   limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10  
22   of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of  
23   Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c) ).



1       **(13)**OFFICIAL REGISTER OF THE UNITED STATES

2       *For necessary expenses incurred in the compilation,*  
3 *editing, indexing, and publishing of the Official Register of*  
4 *the United States, \$30,000: Provided, That the United*  
5 *States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be compiled,*  
6 *edited, indexed, and published each year an Official Register*  
7 *of the United States, which shall contain a full and complete*  
8 *list of all persons occupying administrative and supervisory*  
9 *positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches*  
10 *of the Government, including the District of Columbia, in*  
11 *connection with which salaries are paid from the Treasury*  
12 *of the United States. The register shall show the name;*  
13 *official title; salary, compensation, and emolument; legal*  
14 *residence and place of employment for each person listed*  
15 *therein: Provided, however, That the Official Register shall*  
16 *not contain the name of any postmaster or assistant postmas-*  
17 *ter, or any officer of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps,*  
18 *unless such officer is assigned as an administrative officer.*  
19 *To enable the United States Civil Service Commission to*  
20 *compile and publish the Official Register of the United States*  
21 *on or before December 31 of each year, the Executive Office,*  
22 *the legislative and judicial branches of the Government, the*  
23 *Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the head of*

1 each executive department, independent office, establish-  
 2 ment, and commission of the Government shall, as of the 1st  
 3 day of May of each year, supply to the United States Civil  
 4 Service Commission the data required by this section, upon  
 5 forms approved and furnished by the Commission, in due  
 6 time to permit the publication of the Official Register as pro-  
 7 vided in this section; and no extra compensation shall be  
 8 allowed to any officer, clerk, or employee of the United  
 9 States Civil Service Commission for compiling the Official  
 10 Register.

## 11 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

### 12 OPERATIONS

13 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,  
 14 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses  
 15 for research and development and for establishment of air  
 16 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the  
 17 Federal Airport Act; not to exceed \$10,000 for representa-  
 18 tion allowances and for official entertainment; and purchase  
 19 and repair of skis and snowshoes; ~~(14)~~\$428,000,000  
 20 \$440,600,000: *Provided, (15)*That total costs of aviation  
 21 medicine research for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether  
 22 provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this  
 23 Act, shall not exceed \$1,500,000 or include in excess of 120



positions: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

#### FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed \$50,000 per housing unit in Alaska) ; and purchase of nine aircraft; ~~(16)\$120,000,000~~ \$124,577,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities~~(17)~~:*Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel.

1 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF  
2 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

3 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority  
4 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to  
5 enter into contracts, \$70,000,000, to remain available until  
6 expended.

7 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

8 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
9 research, development, and service testing in accordance  
10 with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C.  
11 1301-1542), including construction of experimental facilities  
12 and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$60,000,-  
13 000, to remain available until expended.

14 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON

15 NATIONAL AIRPORT

16 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-  
17 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington Na-  
18 tional Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of  
19 uniforms, (18)*purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for*  
20 *police-type use which may exceed by \$300 the general pur-*  
21 *chase price limitation for the current fiscal year,* and arms  
22 and ammunition, \$3,225,000,



1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES

2 INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

3 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-  
4 nance, improvement and protection of the Dulles Interna-  
5 tional Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of  
6 uniforms, (19)*purchase of three passenger motor vehicles,*  
7 and arms and ammunition, \$1,975,000.

8 CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

9 For necessary expenses for construction at Washington  
10 National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,200,000,  
11 to remain available until expended.

12 CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, ADDITIONAL

13 WASHINGTON AIRPORT

14 For an additional amount for "Construction and devel-  
15 opment, additional Washington airport", (20)~~\$26,100,000~~  
16 ~~\$20,100,000~~, to remain available until expended.

17 CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

18 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
19 the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including  
20 advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section  
21 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529),

1 ~~(21)\$10,000,000~~ \$12,000,000, to remain available until  
 2 expended.

### 3 GENERAL PROVISION

4 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations  
 5 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the  
 6 Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified  
 7 in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C.  
 8 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Ad-  
 9 ministrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance  
 10 and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles  
 11 and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as au-  
 12 thorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5  
 13 U.S.C. 2131).

## 14 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the  
 17 Commission as authorized by law, including land and struc-  
 18 tures (not to exceed \$48,000), special counsel fees, improve-  
 19 ment and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to  
 20 exceed \$15,600), services as authorized by section 15 of the  
 21 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of  
 22 not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement  
 23 only, ~~(22)\$12,400,000~~ \$12,525,000~~(23)~~: *Provided, That*  
 24 *the limitation until June 30, 1962, on the availability of the*  
 25 *appropriation for a special ultra-high frequency television*



1 study, contained in the *Independent Offices Appropriation Act*,  
 2 1961, under the head "*Federal Communications Commis-*  
 3 *sion*", is hereby extended until December 31, 1962.

#### 4 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

##### 5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,  
 7 as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor  
 8 vehicles and not to exceed \$558,000 for expenses of travel,  
 9 \$8,793,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be avail-  
 10 able for special counsel and services as authorized by section  
 11 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

#### 12 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

##### 13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-  
 15 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized  
 16 by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by  
 17 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
 18 ~~(24)\$10,000,000~~ \$10,690,000: *Provided*, That no part of  
 19 the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any  
 20 investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of  
 21 the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the  
 22 enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such  
 23 investigation.

## 1                   GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

## 2                               SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3           For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,  
4 including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries  
5 without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the  
6 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and services  
7 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
8 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$43,000,000.

## 9                   GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

## 10           OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

11           For necessary expenses of real property management  
12 and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings  
13 in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;  
14 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)  
15 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of  
16 building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and dis-  
17 posal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests there-  
18 in; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of  
19 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521) ; ~~(25)\$170,000,000~~  
20 ~~\$176,000,000~~: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be  
21 available, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June  
22 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to  
23 buildings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appro-  
24 priation for "Emergency operating expenses".



## 1 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

2 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to  
3 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pur-  
4 suant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479),  
5 including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves  
6 and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent  
7 thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for  
8 public buildings; preliminary planning of projects by con-  
9 tract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition,  
10 and equipment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until ex-  
11 pended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropria-  
12 tion, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings  
13 Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the  
14 Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C.  
15 901 et. seq.), and Public Health Service facilities (except  
16 Indian health facilities), ~~(26)~~ *and buildings under the control*  
17 *of another department or agency where alteration of such*  
18 *buildings is required in connection with the moving of such*  
19 *other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter*  
20 *to be, under the control of General Services Administration*  
21 shall be considered to be public buildings.

## 22 CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

23 For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise  
24 provided for, necessary to construct public buildings projects

1 and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where  
 2 the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000  
 3 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat.  
 4 479), including equipment for such buildings, ~~(27)\$171,~~  
 5 ~~600,000~~ \$194,456,500, and not to exceed \$500,000 of this  
 6 amount shall be available to the Administrator for construc-  
 7 tion~~(28), sites and expenses for~~ of small public buildings out-  
 8 side the District of Columbia as the Administrator approves  
 9 and deems necessary, all to remain available until expended:  
 10 *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for  
 11 public buildings projects at locations and at maximum con-  
 12 struction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and  
 13 expenses) as follows:

14 Post office and Federal office building, Decatur, Ala-  
 15 bama, \$1,315,750;

16 Customhouse and Federal office building, Los Angeles,  
 17 California, \$27,388,500;

18 Customs and appraisers warehouse, ~~(29)Long Beach~~  
 19 *Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor* area, California, \$2,-  
 20 000,000;

21 Courthouse and Federal office building, Denver, Colo-  
 22 rado, \$18,145,000;

23 ~~(30)~~*General Services Administration stores depot, Denver,*  
 24 *Colorado, \$5,510,000;*

25 Post office and Federal office building, Statesboro,



1 Georgia, \$538,650, which shall be known as the Prince  
2 H. Preston Building;

3 Post office and Federal office building, Winder, Georgia,  
4 \$475,000;

5 Post office and Federal office building (construction and  
6 alteration), Wyandotte, Michigan, \$402,800;

7 (31) *Post office building, Tupelo, Mississippi, \$789,000;*

8 Post office and Federal office building, Santa Fe, New  
9 Mexico, \$2,362,650;

10 Customhouse, courthouse, and Federal office building,  
11 New York, New York, \$59,222,050;

12 Post office and courthouse, Bryson City, North Carolina,  
13 \$753,350;

14 Post office building, Thomasville, North Carolina, \$327,-  
15 750;

16 Border station, Pembina, North Dakota, \$183,350;

17 Federal office building, Cincinnati, Ohio, \$17,432,500;

18 Post office and Federal office building, Medford, Oregon,  
19 \$1,728,050;

20 Post office and Federal office building (construction and  
21 alteration), Johnstown, Pennsylvania, \$1,187,500;

22 Post office and Federal office building, Lebanon, Penn-  
23 sylvania, \$730,550;

24 (32) *Federal office building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania,*  
25 *\$20,000,000;*

1 (33) *Post office building, Dyersburg, Tennessee, \$901,000;*

2 *Border station, Derby Line, Vermont, \$267,900;*

3 (34) *Post office and courthouse, Montpelier, Vermont,*

4 *\$1,258,000;*

5 *Government Printing Office field plant, District of Co-*  
6 *lumbia, \$1,545,650: Provided further, That the maximum*  
7 *construction improvement costs heretofore approved for the*  
8 *following projects are hereby increased as follows:*

9 *Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of*  
10 *Columbia, is increased from "\$15,105,000" to "\$18,905,-*  
11 *000", including \$5,700,000 for laboratory and other equip-*  
12 *ment;*

13 *Courthouse and Federal office building, Chicago, Illi-*  
14 *nois, is increased from "\$5,500,000" to "\$36,793,000", in-*  
15 *cluding construction of the first of two buildings authorized*  
16 *at this location: Provided further, That the foregoing limits*  
17 *of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are ef-*  
18 *fectured in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum*

19 (35): *Provided further, That funds in the amount of*  
20 *\$5,601,500 appropriated under this head in the Independent*  
21 *Offices Appropriation Act, 1961, for a construction and al-*  
22 *teration project at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, since*  
23 *abandoned as to its previously approved scope, are hereby*  
24 *made available for the purposes of this appropriation.*



1 (36)SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

2       For an additional amount for expenses necessary in  
3 connection with the construction of public buildings projects  
4 not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in  
5 the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and  
6 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings  
7 projects by contract or otherwise \$25,000,000, to remain  
8 available until expended.

9 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

10       For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any  
11 other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to  
12 the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40  
13 U.S.C. 356), \$5,200,000.

14 CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7,

15       WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

16       For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise  
17 provided for, necessary to construct Federal Office Building  
18 Numbered 7 in Washington, District of Columbia, for use  
19 of agencies of the executive branch, in accordance with plans  
20 and specifications provided for in the Independent Offices  
21 Appropriation Acts, 1959 and 1961 (72 Stat. 1067 and 74  
22 Stat. 432), \$23,700,000, to remain available until expended.

# OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as authorized by law and not otherwise provided for, ~~(37)\$3,450,000~~ \$3,737,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,935,000 of any funds received during the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law, shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the General Services Administration under the said Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus personal property.

## EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system, and contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items, ~~(38)\$27,375,000,~~ \$29,374,000.

## GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

To increase the general supply fund established by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 630g), ~~(39)\$4,000,000~~ \$8,000,000.



1       OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND  
2                               RECORDS SERVICE

3       For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-  
4       ords management and related activities as provided by law,  
5       including reimbursement for security guard services, and con-  
6       tractual services incident to movement or disposal of records,  
7       \$14,000,000.

8       OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC  
9                               UTILITIES SERVICE

10       For necessary expenses of transportation and public utili-  
11       ties management and related activities, as provided by law,  
12       including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
13       August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$75  
14       per diem for individuals, ~~(40)\$2,475,000~~ \$2,175,000.

15       (41) *No part of the funds appropriated by the preceding*  
16       *paragraph of this Act shall be used for the preparation or*  
17       *presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal and*  
18       *State Regulatory Agencies concerning the regulatory policies*  
19       *of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property*  
20       *evaluation of transportation or utility companies.*

## 1                   STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

2           For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions  
3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50  
4 U.S.C. 98-98h), during the current fiscal year, for trans-  
5 portation and handling, within the United States (including  
6 charges at United States ports), storage, security, and main-  
7 tenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or trans-  
8 ferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to  
9 section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
10 Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b) ), for carrying  
11 out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of  
12 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools and  
13 industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General  
14 Services Administration is responsible, including reimburse-  
15 ment for security guard services, services as authorized by  
16 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
17 and not to exceed \$3,000,000 for operating expenses,  
18 ~~(42)\$30,000,000~~ \$40,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of  
19 funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or  
20 tank storage facilities: *Provided further*, That during the cur-  
21 rent fiscal year the General Services Administration is author-  
22 ized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not  
23 in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and main-  
24 tenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equip-  
25 ment held pursuant to the aforesaid Acts ~~(43)provided said~~



1 leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government:

2 *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there  
 3 shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and  
 4 critical materials which, in accordance with section 6 (a) of  
 5 the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50  
 6 U.S.C. 98e (a) ), may be transferred without reimbursement  
 7 to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Pro-*  
 8 *vided further*, That any receipts from sales during the cur-  
 9 rent fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treas-  
 10 ury(44): *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year  
 11 materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense  
 12 Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be available,  
 13 without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value  
 14 to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, proe-  
 15 cessing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to sec-  
 16 tion 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling  
 17 Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

#### 18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

19 For expenses of executive direction for activities under  
 20 the control of the General Services Administration, \$290,-  
 21 000.

#### 22 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER 23 PRESIDENTS

24 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August  
 25 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838) , \$300,000: *Provided*, That the Ad-

1 administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary  
 2 of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out  
 3 the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

#### 4 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

5 Funds available to General Services Administration for  
 6 administrative operations, in support of program activities,  
 7 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through  
 8 a single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That  
 9 costs and obligations for such administrative operations for  
 10 the respective program activities shall be accounted for in  
 11 accordance with systems approved by the General Ac-  
 12 counting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount  
 13 deposited into said account for the fiscal year 1962 from  
 14 funds made available to General Services Administration  
 15 in this Act shall not exceed ~~(45)\$14,268,900~~ \$14,864,000:  
 16 *Provided further*, That amounts deposited into said account  
 17 for administrative operations for each program shall not  
 18 exceed the amounts included in the respective program  
 19 appropriations for such purposes.

#### 20 ~~(46)~~WORKING CAPITAL FUND

21 *To increase the capital of the working capital fund es-*  
 22 *tablished by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293),*  
 23 *\$150,000.*



## GENERAL PROVISIONS

2       The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the  
3   General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)  
4   cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,  
5   and improvement, included as part of rentals received from  
6   Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;  
7   (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to  
8   bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the  
9   General Services Administration, issued by public authorities,  
10   States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect  
11   to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems  
12   necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request  
13   and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from  
14   the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropria-  
15   tions or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to  
16   the General Services Administration, in connection with  
17   property transferred to the General Services Administration  
18   pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff),  
19   and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with  
20   the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

21 Appropriations under the heading “Construction, Public  
22 Buildings Projects” shall be available for (1) acquisition of

1 buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or  
2 otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2)  
3 extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and  
4 (3) construction of projects for new public buildings ap-  
5 proved pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959, in  
6 addition to those set forth under that appropriation.

7 Funds available to the General Services Administration  
8 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

9 No part of any money appropriated by this or any  
10 other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the  
11 Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for  
12 the purchase within the continental limits of the United  
13 States of any typewriting machines except in accordance  
14 with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the  
15 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,  
16 as amended.

17 *(47) Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made*  
18 *available to the General Services Administration for the*  
19 *current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any*  
20 *other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall*  
21 *be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: Provided,*  
22 *That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses,*  
23 *and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of*  
24 *\$2,000,000.*

25 Appropriations available to any department or agency



1 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, in-  
2 cluding maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be  
3 available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services  
4 Administration for those expenses of renovation and altera-  
5 tion of buildings and facilities which constitute public im-  
6 provements, performed in accordance with the Public Build-  
7 ings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law,  
8 and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropria-  
9 tions to said Administration for rents and related expenses,  
10 not otherwise provided for, of providing, directly or indi-  
11 rectly, such suitable general purpose space as may be re-  
12 quired by any such department or agency, in the District  
13 of Columbia or elsewhere.

## 14 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### 15 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

#### 16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Adminis-  
18 trator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the  
19 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and purchase of  
20 two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$12,-  
21 900,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of inspections  
22 and of providing representatives at the site of projects being  
23 planned or undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to  
24 title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects  
25 financed through loans to educational institutions author-

1 ized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended,  
2 projects and facilities financed by loans to public agencies  
3 pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as  
4 amended, (48)urban planning financed through grants to  
5 State and local government agencies pursuant to title VII of  
6 the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and reserves of  
7 planned public works financed through advances to munici-  
8 palities and other public agencies pursuant to title VII of the  
9 Housing Act of 1954, as amended, shall be compensated by  
10 such agencies or institutions by the payment of fixed fees  
11 which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such  
12 services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered  
13 nonadministrative; and for the purpose of providing such in-  
14 spections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such  
15 agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such serv-  
16 ices from such institutions, or the Administrator, and shall  
17 credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against  
18 which such charges have been made, but such nonadminis-  
19 trative expenses shall not exceed \$3,000,000.

#### 20 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

21 For grants in accordance with the provisions of sec-  
22 tion 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$3,600,-  
23 000.



PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), ~~(49)\$6,000,000~~ \$8,000,000.

URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$200,000,000.

~~(50)URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH~~

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$450,000.

URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, \$125,000 for research in housing for the aged.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$350,000 of the foregoing amount shall

1 be available for administrative expenses during the current  
2 fiscal year.

3 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

4 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

5 For the payment of annual contributions to public  
6 housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United  
7 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),  
8 \$165,000,000.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

10 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing  
11 Administration, \$13,968,000, to be expended under the  
12 authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this  
13 Act.

14 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce  
17 Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the em-  
18 ployment of special counsel; services as authorized by section  
19 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and pur-  
20 chase of not to exceed forty-two passenger motor vehicles of  
21 which thirty-six shall be for replacement only; ~~(51)\$21,~~  
22 ~~950,000~~ \$22,200,000, of which not less than \$1,696,700  
23 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad  
24 safety activities and not less than \$1,129,000 shall be avail-  
25 able for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection



1 activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and coop-  
 2 erating State commissioners may use Government transpor-  
 3 tation requests when traveling in connection with their  
 4 duties as such.

## 5 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

### 6 ADMINISTRATION

#### 7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of  
 9 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, includ-  
 10 ing not to exceed (52) ~~\$8,000,000~~ \$10,395,000 for expenses  
 11 of travel, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized  
 12 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.  
 13 2131) ; (53) ~~\$191,750,000~~ \$221,750,000.

#### 14 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

15 For contractual research, development, operations, tech-  
 16 nical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction,  
 17 and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the  
 18 conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and  
 19 development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space  
 20 Administration, including maintenance and operation of  
 21 aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of  
 22 fourteen passenger motor vehicles, including one at not to  
 23 exceed \$6,000, of which seven shall be for replacement only ;  
 24 (54) ~~\$892,000,000~~ \$1,278,000,000, to remain available until  
 25 expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall

1 be available for payment of salaries of National Aeronau-  
2 tics and Space Administration personnel.

3 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

4 For construction of facilities for the National Aeronau-  
5 tics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or con-  
6 demnation of real property, as authorized by law, (55)\$116,-  
7 ~~250,000~~ \$249,250,000, (56)of which \$20,000,000 shall be  
8 available for emergency construction of facilities in accord  
9 with section 3 of the legislative authorization for appropria-  
10 tions for the fiscal year 1962, to remain available until  
11 expended.

12 GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made  
14 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-  
15 tion by this Act may be transferred to any other such appro-  
16 priation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation  
17 shall not be thereby increased.

18 Not to exceed (57)\$15,000 \$20,000 of appropriations in  
19 this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-  
20 tion shall be available for such scientific consultations and  
21 emergency or extraordinary expense as may be authorized  
22 by law.



1 ~~(58)~~NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

## 2 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

3 For the operation and maintenance of properties under  
 4 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act,  
 5 \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales,  
 6 leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury  
 7 of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so  
 8 long as funds are available from appropriations for the  
 9 foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the  
 10 Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Con-  
 11 gress), shall not be effective.

## 12 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

## 13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
 15 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42  
 16 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellow-  
 17 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
 18 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire of passenger motor  
 19 vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Admin-  
 20 istration for security guard services; ~~(59)~~\$250,000,000  
 21 \$276,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Pro-*  
 22 *vided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than ~~(60)~~\$37,

1 ~~600,000~~ \$32,200,000 shall be available for tuition, grants,  
 2 and allowances in connection with a program of supplemen-  
 3 tary training for secondary school science and mathematics  
 4 teachers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed (61)\$1,600,-  
 5 ~~000~~ \$2,000,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used  
 6 to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I  
 7 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act  
 8 of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes  
 9 authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act.

## 10 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

### 11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-  
 13 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, (62)*not to exceed*  
 14 \$45,000 for expenses of travel and services as authorized  
 15 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
 16 \$2,900,000.

## 17 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### 18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-  
 20 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and  
 21 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
 22 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) (63)*at rates for individuals not to*  
 23 *exceed \$100 per diem*, \$11,000,000.



## 1           SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

## 2                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3           For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-  
4 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I  
5 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62  
6 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by  
7 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ;  
8 not to exceed \$62,000 for the National Selective Service Ap-  
9 peal Board; and \$19,000 for the National Advisory Commit-  
10 tee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Spe-  
11 cialists; \$33,670,000: *Provided*, That during the current  
12 fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation  
13 from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the  
14 Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such  
15 action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

## 16           VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

## 17                   GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

18           For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-  
19 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses  
20 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-  
21 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; and  
22 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for

1 security guard service; ~~(64)\$161,500,000~~ \$162,046,000:  
 2 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to  
 3 pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public rela-  
 4 tions work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropria-  
 5 tion shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports  
 6 and certifications of attendance at such institutions an  
 7 allowance at a rate in excess of \$1 per month for each eligible  
 8 veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

#### 9 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

#### 10 OPERATING EXPENSES

11 For expenses necessary for administration of the medi-  
 12 cal, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research,  
 13 employee education and training activities, and expenses nec-  
 14 essary for carrying out programs of medical research, as  
 15 authorized by law, ~~(65)\$40,700,000~~ \$47,053,000, of which  
 16 ~~(66)\$27,000,000~~ \$32,000,000 shall be available for medical  
 17 research: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the foregoing appro-  
 18 priations shall remain available until expended for prosthetic  
 19 testing and development.

#### 20 MEDICAL CARE

21 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-  
 22 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as  
 23 authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treat-  
 24 ment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration includ-  
 25 ing care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction



1 of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational  
2 articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms;  
3 repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the  
4 several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the  
5 Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either  
6 by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and  
7 purchase of materials; purchase of seventy-two passenger  
8 motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances  
9 therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid  
10 to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,  
11 United States Code; \$987,171,000, plus reimbursements:  
12 *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from  
13 this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education,  
14 and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy,  
15 and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them  
16 under the various headings of their applicable appropriations,  
17 of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment  
18 of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

#### 19 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

20 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,  
21 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-  
22 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence al-  
23 lowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any  
24 Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon,  
25 including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities,

1 the administration of which is now or may hereafter be  
2 placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment  
3 of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and  
4 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, \$3,500,000,-  
5 000, to remain available until expended.

#### 6 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

7 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans  
8 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment  
9 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and  
10 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-  
11 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38,  
12 United States Code, \$80,000,000, to remain available un-  
13 til expended.

#### 14 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

15 For military and naval insurance, for national service  
16 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-  
17 disabled veterans insurance, \$39,200,000, to remain avail-  
18 able until expended.

#### 19 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

20 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants  
21 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United  
22 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-  
23 ment of veterans, \$1,000,000.



## CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, ~~(67)\$75,000,000~~ \$77,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for technical services for replacement of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tennessee, is reduced from "\$1,500,000" to "\$921,600".

## LOAN ~~(68)GUARANTEE~~ GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Loan ~~(69)guarantee~~ guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses ~~(70), but not to exceed \$120,624,000,~~ for property acquisitions and other loan ~~(71)guarantee~~ guaranty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, Title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund

1 shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer  
2 to said Loan (72) ~~guarantee~~ *guaranty* revolving fund in such  
3 amounts as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing  
4 expenses.

#### 5 SUPPLY FUND

6 During the current fiscal year, the Supply fund shall be  
7 available for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle.

#### 8 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

9 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the  
10 current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Read-  
11 justment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemni-  
12 ties" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned ap-  
13 propriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-  
14 priations so augmented.

15 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-  
16 tion for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall  
17 be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the  
18 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

19 The appropriation available to the Veterans Adminis-  
20 tration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall  
21 be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental  
22 thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of  
23 title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Vet-  
24 erans Administration receiving care under such appropria-  
25 tions.



1 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-  
 2 erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Con-  
 3 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be  
 4 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the con-  
 5 struction of any new hospital or home.

6 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-  
 7 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except  
 8 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits  
 9 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ap-  
 10 propriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administra-  
 11 tor of Veterans Affairs.

## 12 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-  
 14 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-  
 15 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel  
 16 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in  
 17 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*  
 18 *vided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed  
 19 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards  
 20 of the Selective Service System, ~~(73)~~ or to travel performed  
 21 in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by  
 22 the Civil Aeronautics Board ~~(74)~~ or to payments to inter-  
 23 agency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget  
 24 schedules.

25 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in

1 this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person  
2 filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly  
3 held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces  
4 of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his  
5 period of active military or naval service and has within  
6 ninety days after his release from such service or from hos-  
7 pitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not  
8 more than one year made application for restoration to his  
9 former position and has been certified by the Civil Service  
10 Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his  
11 former position and has not been restored thereto.

12       SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available  
13 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase  
14 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new  
15 offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this  
16 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been ap-  
17 proved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

## 18                   TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

19       The following corporations and agencies, respectively,  
20 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the  
21 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each  
22 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to  
23 make such contracts and commitments without regard to  
24 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the  
25 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may



1 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the  
2 Budget for the fiscal year 1962 for each such corporation  
3 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

4       FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

5   LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-  
6   TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

7       Not to exceed a total of \$1,725,000 shall be available  
8 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank  
9 Board, including services as authorized by section 15 of the  
10 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed  
11 \$100 per diem for individuals, and shall be derived from funds  
12 available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including  
13 those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund  
14 and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administra-  
15 tion, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home  
16 Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal  
17 years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment  
18 for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the  
19 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan In-  
20 surance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government  
21 (including payment for office space): *Provided*, That all  
22 necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship  
23 of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan In-  
24 surance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-  
25 ceedings under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan

1 Act of 1933 or section 407 (75) or 408 of the National Hous-  
2 ing Act and all necessary expenses (including services  
3 performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other  
4 personal services) in connection with the handling, including  
5 the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of  
6 Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retire-  
7 ment of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under  
8 the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-  
9 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes  
10 hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates  
11 of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be  
12 entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by  
13 the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance  
14 at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council  
15 and may be paid not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of  
16 subsistence: *Provided further*, That expenses of any func-  
17 tions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks)  
18 vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as  
19 nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That, not-  
20 withstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for  
21 the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the admin-  
22 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall  
23 be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the pro-  
24 visions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22,  
25 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Provided fur-*



1 *ther*, That the nonadministrative expenses (except those  
2 included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and  
3 examination of Federal and State chartered institutions  
4 (other than special examinations determined by the Board  
5 to be necessary) shall not exceed \$10,366,000.

6 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL  
7 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

8 Not to exceed \$890,000 shall be available for adminis-  
9 trative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall  
10 be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capital-  
11 ized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation  
12 of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of pro-  
13 ceedings under section 407 (76) or 408 of the National  
14 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived  
15 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action  
16 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of  
17 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-  
18 penses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home  
19 Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly  
20 allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may util-  
21 ize and may make payment for services and facilities of the  
22 Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the  
23 Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the  
24 Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other  
25 provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount

1 hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other  
2 obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and  
3 paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934,  
4 as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-1730a).

5       GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

6   LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-  
7       STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION  
8       FUND

9       Not to exceed \$42,500 (to be computed on an accrual  
10 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of  
11 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General  
12 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1  
13 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the cur-  
14 rent fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the  
15 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein  
16 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to in-  
17 clude all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-  
18 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including  
19 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative  
20 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of serv-  
21 ices performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with  
22 the termination of contracts or in the performance of legal  
23 services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of admin-  
24 istrative expenses to the account shall be made in accord-



1   ance with generally recognized accounting principles and  
2   practices.

### 3           HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

#### 4   LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF 5           THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

6       Not to exceed ~~(77)\$1,900,000~~ \$2,100,000 shall be  
7   available for all administrative expenses of carrying out the  
8   functions of the Administrator under the program of housing  
9   loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act  
10   of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this  
11   amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facili-  
12   ties of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the  
13   Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the  
14   meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance  
15   Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C.  
16   264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the  
17   Treasury as a depository of public money of the United  
18   States.

#### 19   LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF 20           THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

21       Not to exceed ~~(78)\$650,000~~ \$750,000 of funds in the  
22   revolving fund established pursuant to title II of Housing  
23   Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for  
24   administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of

1 payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve  
2 banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks,  
3 and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creat-  
4 ing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of  
5 August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has  
6 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a  
7 depository of public money of the United States.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
9 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-  
10 ING PROGRAMS)

11 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$145,000  
12 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this  
13 amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case  
14 of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Gov-  
15 ernment and legal services on a contract or fee basis and  
16 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve  
17 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the  
18 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-  
19 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the  
20 Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal  
21 Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has  
22 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-  
23 pository of public money of the United States.



1    LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL  
2                    NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

3        Not to exceed \$7,400,000 shall be available for admin-  
4    istrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and  
5    shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including ex-  
6    penses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or  
7    fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of  
8    securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures,  
9    fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services  
10   performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not  
11   including other personal services) in connection with the  
12   acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improve-  
13   ment, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to  
14   said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries,  
15   wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed out-  
16   side of the continental United States, expenses of services  
17   performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the  
18   performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses  
19   reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said As-  
20   sociation may utilize and may make payment for services  
21   and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies  
22   of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of ad-  
23   ministrative expenses to the accounts of the Association

1 shall be made in accordance with generally recognized ac-  
 2 counting principles and practices.

3 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-  
 4 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

5 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-  
 6 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$9,600,000  
 7 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration  
 8 shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing  
 9 Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or  
 10 allowances therefore, as authorized by the Act of September  
 11 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) : *Provided*, That funds  
 12 shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to ex-  
 13 ceed \$1,500) : *Provided further*, That nonadministrative ex-  
 14 penses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2  
 15 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all  
 16 appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing  
 17 shall not exceed ~~(79)\$58,000,000~~ \$61,300,000~~(80)~~: *Pro-*  
 18 *vided further, That the foregoing limitation shall not apply to*  
 19 *fees and other expenses paid by and between private parties in*  
 20 *connection with cases processed under the Certified Agency*  
 21 *Program.*

22 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-  
 23 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

24 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-  
 25 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the admin-



1 istrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in  
2 carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act  
3 of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433), including  
4 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by  
5 the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) :  
6 *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representa-  
7 tives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal proj-  
8 ects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal  
9 projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Ad-  
10 ministration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the  
11 payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to  
12 the development costs of such projects will cover the costs  
13 of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Ad-  
14 ministration for such purpose shall be considered nonad-  
15 ministrative expenses, and funds received from such pay-  
16 ments may be used only for the payment of necessary ex-  
17 penses of providing representatives of the Administration  
18 at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That  
19 all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not spe-  
20 cifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties im-  
21 posed by law, shall not exceed \$1,200,000.

### 22 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

23 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in  
24 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
25 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for

1 publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or  
2 defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

3       SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in  
4 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
5 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to  
6 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel  
7 work in excess of the number that would be provided by a  
8 ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five,  
9 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent em-  
10 ployees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided,*  
11 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-  
12 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend halftime  
13 or more in personnel administration consisting of direction  
14 and administration of the personnel program; employment,  
15 placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification;  
16 employee relations and services; wage administration; and  
17 processing, recording, and reporting.

18       SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in  
19 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any  
20 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for  
21 construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or  
22 leased buildings except where specifically provided.





---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 31, 1961

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the  
Senate numbered









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

## CONTENTS

Issued August 2, 1961  
For actions of August 1, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 130

### Appropriations

|                          |            |
|--------------------------|------------|
| .....                    | 2,3,6,7,13 |
| Bald eagle.....          | 27         |
| Civil defense.....       | 7          |
| Cooperatives.....        | 24         |
| Education.....           | 30         |
| Electrification.....     | 5          |
| Employment.....          | 18         |
| Farm labor.....          | 26         |
| Farm loans.....          | 4          |
| Farm program.....        | 9,22,41    |
| Feed grains.....         | 23         |
| Fisheries.....           | 15         |
| Foreign aid.....         | 11         |
| Foreign currencies.....  | 8          |
| Foreign trade.....       | 8,25       |
| Forestry.....            | 6,29       |
| Housing.....             | 12,32,43   |
| Lands.....               | 34         |
| Legislative program..... | 20         |
| Manpower.....            | 33         |

|                          |          |
|--------------------------|----------|
| Milk marketing.....      | 35       |
| Mining.....              | 14       |
| Personnel.....           | 38       |
| Price support.....       | 23,37    |
| Procurement.....         | 44       |
| Property.....            | 36       |
| Public Law 480.....      | 8        |
| Reclamation.....         | 28       |
| Research.....            | 6,21     |
| School lunch.....        | 19       |
| Sugar.....               | 17       |
| Surplus commodities..... | 19,31    |
| Taxation.....            | 39       |
| Textiles.....            | 17       |
| Tobacco.....             | 10       |
| Transportation.....      | 45       |
| Urban affairs.....       | 12,32,43 |
| Water facilities.....    | 4        |
| Water resources.....     | 20       |
| Wheat.....               | 8        |
| Wildlife.....            | 36       |
| Youth Conservation.....  | 1,42     |

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported bill for lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments. Senate committee voted to report bill to establish Youth Conservation Corps. House committee voted to report foreign aid authorization bill. Sen. Moss urged additional appropriations for FHA water facilities loans. Senate debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Sen. Johnston introduced and discussed bill to establish price support program for untied Flue-cured tobacco.

## SENATE

1. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 404, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps in the Department of Labor. p. D644
2. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. Continued debate on this bill, H. R. 7035 (pp. 13204-16, 13219-29, 13232-45). By a vote of 22 to 67, rejected en bloc a group of amendments by Sen. Proxmire which he stated would "reduce every item in the appropriation bill ... back to the budget estimates. This would save approximately \$297 million." (pp. 13212-16, 13219-29, 13232-34).
3. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 7851 (S. Rept. 653). p. 13191
4. WATER FACILITIES LOANS. Sen. Moss urged additional funds for FHA water facilities loans, particularly in Utah, stated that the "amount appropriated for soil

and water conservation loans has gradually decreased each year from \$11,500,000 in 1955 to \$2 million in 1960, notwithstanding the need and demand for assistance and the accumulation of a backlog of applications for loans," and inserted his letter to President Kennedy stating that he felt it imperative before this session of Congress adjourns "that the amount of the funds available in the fiscal year 1962 for Farmers Home Administration soil and water loans be substantially increased. I hope the administration will send a supplemental budget request to the Congress for this purpose of at least \$20 million." pp. 13198-9

5. ELECTRIFICATION. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1606, to authorize the Federal Power Commission to exempt small hydroelectric projects from certain of the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act. p. D643
6. FORESTRY. Sen. Stennis discussed the importance of forestry research to the development and maintenance of our forest resources and expressed disappointment that more funds were not included in the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1962 for additional forest research. pp. 13200-01
7. APPROPRIATIONS. The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee on H. R. 7445, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1962, includes the following statement regarding appropriations for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization: "The committee recommends \$5 million for civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies, which is a reduction of \$1,567,000 below the House allowance at the 1961 level and \$3,700,000 below the budget estimate. The committee believes that many of these delegated functions are not required to be continued indefinitely."
8. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Aiken inserted a report on the meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group held June 8 and 9, 1961, which included a discussion of trade relations between the two countries and a statement that it was necessary for Canada to export 86 percent of its wheat production. pp. 13194-6  
Sen. Javits submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to S. 1729, the proposed Foreign Commerce Act of 1961, which would authorize the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 to help finance the costs incurred outside the United States by foreign exhibitors who wish to participate in trade, industrial, agricultural, horticultural, and scientific fairs, expositions, and exhibits in the United States. p. 13250

#### HOUSE

9. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that "Conferees met in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of S. 1643, proposed Agricultural Act of 1961, but did not reach final agreement." p. D646
10. TOBACCO. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 1022, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments (H. Rept. 826). p. 13306
11. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Foreign Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 8400, the foreign aid authorization bill. p. D645



12. HOUSING. The Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 6433, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. p. D645
13. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 7445, the independent offices appropriations bill for 1962. Senate conferees have already been appointed. pp. 13252-3
14. MINING. The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 84, to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands. p. D646
15. FISHERIES. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 206, to facilitate administration of the fishery loan fund. p. D646
16. SUGAR. Received from the Minnesota Legislature, a memorial asking Congress to increase sugarbeet allotments for Minnesota farmers. p. 13307
17. TEXTILES. Rep. Hemphill discussed the textile problem, and inserted several articles. pp. 13287-94
18. EMPLOYMENT. Several Representatives discussed the employment problem in the U. S. and inserted several articles. pp. 13272-87
19. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Received from the Minnesota Legislature a memorial requesting Congress to enact laws providing for more widespread use of farm commodities for school lunch and welfare programs. p. 13307
20. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that H. R. 30, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact, will be considered on Wed., Aug. 2. p. 13252

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. RESEARCH. Extension of remarks of Sen. Case, S. Dak., inserting an article, "Desalting Water: Long Way To Go." pp. A5897-8
22. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Shriver inserting the results of an opinion poll, and stating that "It is interesting to note that over 80 percent of all participants expressed opposition to more Federal regulation of agriculture ..." p. A5898  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Goodling inserting an article, "The Holstein Hour," discussing "a farmer who has installed television sets in his barn because he found that his cows gave more milk while watching television than they did while standing sullenly in barnish gloom." pp. A5914-5  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Santangelo supporting H. R. 8230, the Agricultural Act of 1961. p. A5940
23. FEED GRAINS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Beckworth inserting a table showing the number of farmers participating in price support loan programs for barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat in 1958, 1959, and 1960. pp. A5901-2



24. COOPERATIVES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cunningham saying, "If the co-ops are bent upon destruction of the private grain trade, then it may be time for the Congress to give a close and careful look at their entire operations and at tax legislation as it applies to them." pp. A5906-7
25. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Saylor saying, "With the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expiring a year hence, now is a most appropriate time to serve notice on the executive department that future trade pacts must be made in favor of America's industries and labor instead of assorted peoples whose only interest in us is what our Government can do for them." p. A5912
26. MIGRATORY LABOR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Widnall saying, "There is no secret in the fact that there is room for improvement in migrant labor standards ... But it seems only elementary fairness to call attention to progress that has been made." p. A5915
27. BALD EAGLE. Extension of remarks of Sen. Yarborough, inserting a speech of Sen. Gruening urging more protection for the bald eagle and suggesting that a number of these birds be transplanted to Alaska. pp. A5924-5
28. RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Moss inserting an article, "Nation in Need of Reclamation." p. A5933
29. FORESTRY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Gavin inserting an article, "Your Forest Ranger." pp. A5945-6

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

30. EDUCATION. S. 2352, by Sen. Case, S. Dak., to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas, and to provide for the application of such laws to American Samoa; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee.  
H. R. 8440, by Rep. Rivers, Alaska, to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to Education and Labor Committee.
31. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. H. R. 8432, by Rep. Hoeven, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to Agriculture Committee.  
H. R. 8433, by Rep. Hoeven, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities to such nations at prices less than those prices available to American consumers; to Agriculture Committee.
32. URBAN AFFAIRS. H. R. 8429, by Rep. Fascell, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; to Government Operations Committee.
33. MANPOWER. H. R. 8430, by Rep. Goodell, relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation; to Education and Labor Committee.



nent RECORD, so as to make it read as follows:

Page 12911, column 2:

It will be October or November 1965 before they can be delivered and used to carry our troops.

Page 12911, column 3:

It would require a small wing fix. The major part of the work would be to replace wornout motors of the C-124's. Another useful aircraft which can be converted for military use and which is in plentiful supply is the DC-7. A test of air cargo carriers has proved that plane to be an excellent commercial cargo workhorse.

Page 12911, column 3:

Beefing up and strengthening the C-97's will provide an airlift capacity of tremendous value.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The corrections will be made.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, August 2, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1, 1961:

##### U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for the term expiring January 27, 1964, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

# House of Representatives

TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

St. John's tribute to Jesus in the prolog of his gospel: John 1:4: *In Him was life; and the life was the light of men.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, we worship and adore Thee whose presence is our shield in the stillness of the night and our strength in the struggles of each new day.

May we now feel, in some special sense that, in this moment of prayer, this Chamber may be for all of us a place of vision and of inspiration.

Bless us with fervor and fidelity as we continue to pray and labor for the coming of that time when heavy-burdened and heartbroken humanity shall be emancipated from the godless and evil forces of aggression and aggrandizement.

Bestow upon our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress the unction of Thy holy spirit, enabling them to mediate light and hope to a world groping in darkness.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7445. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week, if he can give us such information at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Today the airport bill will be brought up extending the Federal Airport Act.

Tomorrow, if the Committee on Rules reports out a rule on the bill S. 2311, which is the same as the bill H.R. 8353, which I have listed on the program heretofore, that bill will be the first order of business. I have been informed and I want to advise the Members to expect a rollcall on that bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman know whether or not a rule has been reported on that bill? I see the chairman of the committee is here.

Mr. VINSON. I appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning, and I have every assurance that a rule will be filed so that the bill may be in order to be considered tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. How much time will be allowed for general debate?

Mr. VINSON. A rule has been granted. There will be 2 hours of general debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT] and one-half by myself. It is an open rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thereafter we will take up H.R. 30, which is on the program. That is the New England compact bill.

As to Thursday, after a conference yesterday with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, your conference was with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], the leader of our party.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said, after a talk with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, sitting outside of the Chamber here, as the three of us were, they very kindly discussed the reorganization plan with me so that I could advise the Members of the House when it would be called up. The gentleman from Iowa has assured me that he would call up plan No. 6 and, therefore, after our talk I set that down for Thursday next.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman, as far as our side is concerned, without undertaking to speak for all of the Members on our side, of course, we had considerable discussion

about plan No. 6 and found that many Members on our side are not in disagreement with the plan.

Mr. McCORMACK. I doubt if the debate will be long from information I have received—if there is any debate at all. But, after reorganization plan No. 6, then if the Committee on Rules reports out rules tomorrow on two bills that have been reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H.R. 7856, relating to certain reorganization aspects in relation to the Federal Communications Commission, and the other bill, H.R. 8033, ICC Act, orders of hearing officers, as I say, those two bills will be programed for Thursday also, of course, with the expectation that we will dispose of the legislative business of this week by Thursday, and I am confident that the House will cooperate to that end.

Mr. HALLECK. Were both of the bills reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. McCORMACK. They have been reported and the Committee on Rules is giving a hearing on both of them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the calling up of Reorganization Plan No. 6 is conditional upon whether the distinguished Speaker will recognize a Member for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. That is always a question that has to be answered.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, CORPORATIONS, AGENCIES, AND OFFICES, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and, of course, I will not object, the other body has adopted an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill and, in addition, has reduced appropriations from \$390,000 to \$90,000 which would prevent the General Services Adminis-



tration from acting for the Government before Federal and State regulatory agencies to produce evidence and information relating to the reasonableness of rates charged to the Government as a consumer. Furthermore, the amendment would, as I said, reduce the funds for the GSA in this important work by 77 percent.

The 1956 Congress criticized the executive agencies for not doing more in securing rate reductions for utilities for the important SAGE program which at that time was estimated to cost \$240 million annually. So through the work of the GSA and the Air Force, the utilities bill for SAGE and in other areas has been reduced by some \$150 million to \$200 million.

This was done as the result of the GSA representing the Government as a consumer, and as the Government gets reduced rates, that benefits the users in private fields and in individual capacities.

For this reason, if the Senate amendment is adopted GSA could merely appear before the agency but could not produce evidence that rates were unreasonable.

The organic act establishing the General Services organization in its policy statement on communications and supply and service matters gave the GSA the responsibility of carrying out the policies of the Government in this important field; in other words, I call to the attention of my friend and of the House members of the conference committee that this is not simply a minor amendment, but the far-reaching results of this would be, in my opinion, for the Federal Government to pay rates for telephone, transportation, and this entire field that would amount to many millions of dollars each year.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], as Chairman of the subcommittee, is well acquainted with this because he and I have discussed this on many occasions during the past several years. His subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations have played a very important part in the General Services Administration and it has saved our Government countless millions of dollars. If this amendment prevails, the Air Force, the Army, and every agency will have to establish its own unit to protect the Government where its activities are concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, YATES, CANNON, OSTERTAG, and TABER.

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to call the attention of my colleagues to the front page story appearing in the press of today under a

London dateline, announcing the intention of the British Commonwealth to join the Common Market setup in the operation of their trade relations.

May I say to the Members of the House that this could mean just one more complication for the basic industries of the United States. This is one of the major reasons for some drastic changes in our present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

#### AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 391, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8102) to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is always a quorum call quite early, I make the point of order at this time that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 125]

|           |              |                  |
|-----------|--------------|------------------|
| Alford    | Flynt        | Morrison         |
| Ashley    | Fogarty      | Multer           |
| Barrett   | Garland      | Norrell          |
| Blatnik   | Gray         | Pike             |
| Blitch    | Healey       | Powell           |
| Boland    | Hébert       | Price            |
| Buckley   | Hollifield   | Rabaut           |
| Cannon    | Kelly        | Roberts          |
| Clark     | Keogh        | Scott            |
| Coad      | Kilday       | Shelley          |
| Dent      | McSweeney    | Taylor           |
| Denton    | Machrowicz   | Thompson, La.    |
| Derwinski | Mason        | Tupper           |
| Evins     | Miller, Clem | Udall, Morris K. |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 395 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 391 provides for the consideration of H.R. 8102, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 8102 would make changes in existing law to accomplish the following purposes:

First. To discontinue for the future the practice of authorizing the Administrator to enter into contracts obligating Federal funds in advance of appropriations as the means of furnishing Federal aid to airports. The bill would authorize appropriations for the purpose of furnishing such aid and, except for any unused obligational authority remaining available under existing law, the Administrator would be required, in the future, to obtain appropriations before obligating Federal funds.

Second. To authorize, for the purpose of furnishing Federal aid for airport development, appropriations totaling \$375 million to become available over a 5-year period, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

Third. To limit the use of Federal funds in the construction of airport buildings to that portion of an approved project directly related to the safety of persons.

Fourth. To require airport operators or owners to furnish, without cost to the Federal Government, such rights in real property as the Administrator deems necessary to construct at Federal expense facilities to house Federal activities related to air traffic control.

Fifth. To provide that any Federal funds apportioned to a State which are not obligated after 2 years shall revert to the discretionary fund and eliminate the annual reapportionment of such unobligated funds required by existing law.

Sixth. To place greater emphasis on the safe and efficient use of airports by aircraft.

Seventh. To expedite the national airport program by requiring advance announcement of the program of airport development intended to be undertaken during the following fiscal year.

An adequate transportation system is vital to the growth of our economy and to our national defense.

Rapid developments in science and technology in recent years have resulted in spectacular advances in aviation, with a resultant increase in airport needs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 391.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], 30 minutes and reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, I believe, has explained the pertinent points of the bill this rule makes in order for consideration. I am not so sure in my own mind that this is the way airports should be provided for users of the airways, but certainly at this stage of the game we cannot do anything else.

Anyone who has given any attention at all to the financial status of the scheduled airlines knows they are not at this time in a position to finance the construction of air terminals.

We established this method of financing terminals 12 years ago and there is no reason why we should change it today.

I may say to my Democratic friends on the right that we Republicans come on the floor today with a sort of tongue-in-cheek attitude. You will recall that as long as it was our responsibility to keep the books and our responsibility to balance the budget, the leadership on the Democratic side, the leadership in both the House and the Senate, insisted, in fact pressed, for a Federal Aid to Airport Act that would cost \$100 million a year. That was prevented in one case by a Presidential veto by President Eisenhower, and in the next instance, by a coalition of some Republicans and other conservative members on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it was defeated. We were able to hold the program down to a cost of \$65 million.

Since it is now your responsibility to keep the books and avoid a deficit, if possible, you have now retreated from the \$100 million proposal and are back in line with the cost that the Republicans presented through the Eisenhower administration, a cost of about \$65 million or \$70 million a year. For that we commend you and want to join you in support of this bill.

The gentleman from Texas pointed out the most significant part of the legislation before us today. We are in fact, Mr. Speaker, setting a precedent, because to the best of my knowledge this is the first time we have terminated the so-called back-door spending in any Federal program after it has once been accepted.

So certainly the bill should be very favorably accepted on that basis, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the chairman of the subcommittee particularly, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], are to be commended for that very commendable improvement in the present act.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I do regard in some respects we are treating with a band-aid a program affecting one of the great common carriers. Instead of the so-called single item treatment, I feel we should be giving our serious consideration to the needs and the problems of the very serious financial situation facing all common carriers, not just the airlines.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House would come to this body with some proposal whereby we could coordinate the programs, the regulation, the tax responsibilities, and all other facts that affect all common carriers, instead of just coming here with a piecemeal proposal that we are considering today.

I do not say that this program, this particular Airport Act, should be deferred until such consideration could be had, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that unless Congress takes another look at the plight of our common carrier industry, we are going to see them become nationalized one by one. Just recently one of the oldest and the only railroad serving the New England States went into bankruptcy.

Our airlines that earned \$63 million in the year 1955 last year showed a profit of \$1 million. The unregulated carriers that in 1946 carried approximately 15 percent of the freight are now carrying about 30 percent.

If some action is not taken by the Congress, it is estimated that by 1970 the unregulated carriers will be carrying as much as 60 percent of our freight. If the Congress wants our common carrier industry to become nationalized, we can continue to ignore these industry problems. If we do not want them to become nationalized, I feel that is one of the most serious problems facing not only this session of Congress but the one to follow next January.

The Washington Post on last Saturday, which is usually a reliable spokesman for this administration, stated that the Kennedy administration had elected not to present to the Congress any comprehensive overall recommendations for the common carrier industry, first, because their thinking had not yet crystallized and, second, because the President himself thought that maybe there had already been too many messages to the Congress. If the administration does not address itself to this problem, I think in the very near future it will be the responsibility of the House, more particularly the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to look directly at this problem.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. I think the gentleman has done a fine job in showing how this has taken place, that is, in regard to the cost of the program. I think likewise it would be well to point out, as appears on page 2 of the report, that the majority are now accepting the Quesada approach to this problem, which led to the veto and for which so many of us were criticized, in that the money is not permitted to be spent for other than safety features in terminal facilities. That was the big issue, was it not? That was the issue that was fought out that they disagreed with, and now they are wholeheartedly endorsing it.

Mr. AVERY. I would say in reply to the gentleman from Florida, what he

said is essentially true. The Eisenhower proposal as was presented by the FAA Administrator, Mr. Elwood Quesada, was not identical to this. I believe the amount of money authorized was primarily the same as carried in this bill, but the formula for the amounts for the individual fiscal years varied somewhat. The Eisenhower program proceeded on the theory that a greater amount of money should be spent now and then gradually reduced each succeeding fiscal year until finally the Federal Government could withdraw from the program entirely. There were some restrictions in the use of the funds as proposed in the bill by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE]. There were some restrictions as to what the money could be used for, but it was not as restricted as was the Eisenhower proposal.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, following the President's speech last week, I read various statements in the papers in regard to the necessity for belt-tightening on domestic programs. Now, I take it from the gentleman's statement here today that this program would constitute an exception to the minority position in regard to belt-tightening; that we should forget about those warnings on belt-tightening as far as this program is concerned.

Mr. AVERY. I would only say this, that had this bill been introduced after the observations were made by the President, perhaps that connotation could be drawn, but this bill was introduced in January, and certainly at that time we were not facing this military situation that we are in today.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I just wanted to say that Federal aid to education is in the same position, and I know the gentleman will not claim that we should tighten our belts on that, either.

Here are a few of the critical economic ills in our transportation picture:

First. Railroads—expenditures for new equipment of one-third from last year, carloadings down 13 percent and earnings down to 1.45 percent. One of the oldest railroads and virtually the only one serving the New England States has gone into bankruptcy.

Second. All airlines made only about \$1 million profit last year compared to \$63 million in 1955. This represents only 2.9 percent on investment, whereas CAB maintains a return of 10.5 percent is necessary to keep the industry in a strong financial condition. This has largely come about because of the extensive cost of adding new jets to the inventory of the trunk lines. These same jets are frequently running 60-percent filled. This grim picture prevails despite the fact the airlines have captured approximately one-half of the total common carrier passenger service as compared to only 14.2 in 1955.

Third. Unregulated private and contract carriers now haul one-third of the









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

### CONTENTS

Issued August 4, 1961  
For actions of August 3, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 132

|                            |    |                        |    |
|----------------------------|----|------------------------|----|
| Adjourned.....             | 16 |                        |    |
| Appropriations...3,5,10,15 |    |                        |    |
| Assistant Secretaries...12 |    |                        |    |
| Atomic energy.....         | 14 |                        |    |
| Budgeting.....             | 27 |                        |    |
| Buildings.....             | 25 |                        |    |
| Civil defense.....         | 3  |                        |    |
| Conflicts of interest...15 |    |                        |    |
| Contracts.....             | 25 |                        |    |
| Cotton.....                | 21 |                        |    |
| Education.....3,7,20       |    |                        |    |
| Electrification.....       | 19 |                        |    |
| Farm program.....1,22      |    |                        |    |
| Fisheries.....             | 11 |                        |    |
| Foreign aid...6,9,15,17,22 |    |                        |    |
| Foreign trade.....         | 21 | Sugar.....             | 18 |
| Lands.....                 | 23 | Tobacco.....           | 15 |
| Legislative program..15,22 |    | Travel allowances..... | 8  |
| Livestock feed.....        | 2  | Water compact.....     | 4  |
| Peace Corps.....           | 6  | Water resources.....   | 28 |
| Per diem.....              | 8  | Water rights.....      | 24 |
| Research.....              | 7  | Wetlands.....          | 26 |
| Rural development.....     | 13 | Wildlife.....          | 26 |

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on farm bill. Senate concurred in House amendments on bill to provide CCC feed for livestock in disaster areas. House concurred in Senate amendments on bill to authorize increased per diem travel rates. Rep. May and others commended rural development program. Senate debated Defense Department appropriation bill. Senate subcommittee voted to report State-Justice appropriation bill.

### SENATE

- FARM PROGRAM.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 1643, the omnibus farm bill (pp. 13502-9, 13538-49). This bill will now be sent to the President. See Digest 131 for a summary of the bill as agreed to.
- LIVESTOCK FEED.** Concurred in the House amendments to S. 2197, to provide that feed owned or controlled by CCC shall be made available at any price not less than 75 percent of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle, sheep, and goats in any area of the U. S. where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, provided that such feed will be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for the livestock. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13523

3. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 7851 (pp. 13463-4, 13470-90, 13493-502, 13509-13, 13516, 13521-3). As reported by the Appropriations Committee the bill included an item of \$207,600,000 for civil defense activities, including authorization for the Defense Department, with the approval of the Budget Bureau, to allocate or transfer funds to other Federal agencies to carry out such civil defense activities as may be assigned to them. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Robertson to strike out language of the bill authorizing the allocation or transfer of civil defense funds to other Federal agencies (pp. 13509-13). Sen. Robertson explained that he had been informed by <sup>the</sup> Parliamentarian that the entire item for civil defense would be subject to a point of order if this language was not stricken from the bill. Pending at adjournment was a proposed amendment by Sen. Mundt to extend for a 3-year period Federal assistance to schools in federally impacted areas (pp. 13516, 13521-3).
4. WATER COMPACT. Passed without amendment S. 2245, to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain water compacts by Nebr., Wyo. and S. Dak., in order to extend the time for such negotiations. p. 13490
5. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments this bill, H. R. 7371. p. D658
6. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Humphrey inserted a letter from Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, stating the reasons why he felt that the Peace Corps should be "separate and distinct from our foreign aid program." pp. 13523-4
7. RESEARCH; EDUCATION. Both Houses received from the State Department a proposed bill "to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950"; to S. Finance and H. Ways and Means Committees. pp. 13458, 13602

#### HOUSE

8. TRAVEL ALLOWANCES. Agreed to the Senate amendments on H. R. 3279, to authorize an increase in the rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business. This bill will now be sent to the President (pp. 13528-9). See Digest 121 for a summary of the bill as agreed to.
9. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Affairs Committee was granted until midnight Sat., Aug. 5, to file a report on H. R. 8400, the foreign aid authorization bill. p. 13563  
Rep. Haley criticized H. R. 8400 saying, "I will be forced to oppose the new foreign aid authorization bill on the grounds that it is unconstitutional and that, even if it were a legal exercise of our powers under the Constitution it is unwise and unsound, wasteful and destructive of this country's very economy." pp. 13593-5
10. APPROPRIATIONS. The conferees were granted until midnight Fri., Aug. 4, to file a conference report on H. R. 7445, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1962. p. 13528  
~~Both Houses agreed to the conference report, and acted on amendments in disagreement, on H. R. 7208, the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1962. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13490-2, 13529-30~~



of Defense possibly has a greater stake in basic research than any other Department.

I think the security of our country may well be dependent upon this. I voted yesterday for \$549 million for NASA, an appropriation, to help get it through in a hurry, where many people said, "Let's cut it back; let's cut off \$200 million." I am not for that kind of business.

I think that this may be a turning point in the scientific and technological history of civilization. We are exploring now far out here in the areas that we ordinary people know little or nothing about.

It is an area of mystery for us. I could not help but think—you know, we use the simple example of Christopher Columbus. He went shopping around looking for somebody to help him, and he finally got that King and Queen of Spain on his side, primarily the Queen, and they sent these ships off here. For a while Spain was a world power, and I think Spain was a world power simply because Spain financed one of the first great exploration projects.

There has been a good deal of basic research done on this, too, about the nature of the world, its surface, and that projected Spain as a world power. She did not last long. It was not because of any failure of Columbus, but back home. But I could not help but think yesterday, although I did not say this yesterday because we were trying to get the money and I wanted it in a hurry, but today we are visiting; I could not help but think how important it was for us to take this chance and maybe it will all be wasted, I do not know. But I am convinced that if you do not do it, we will not be around to waste anything.

So I am on the side of taking an extra chance on these things.

#### TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 2079. A bill to retrocede to North Carolina jurisdiction over the southern, east-bound lanes of North Carolina Highway 24, and the eastern, northbound lanes of U.S. Highway 17, as these highways traverse and parallel Camp Lejeune, N.C. (Rept. No. 656).

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 181. An act to amend sections 3253 and 8253 of title 10, United States Code (Rept. No. 657).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 4321. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members (Rept. No. 658).

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7657. An act to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, to provide a specific statutory authority for prosecution of bad check offenses (Rept. No. 659).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7722. An act to amend section 3579, title 10, United States Code, to provide that commissioned officers of the Medical Service Corps may exercise command outside the

Army Medical Service when directed by proper authority (Rept. No. 660).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1240. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the 1962 Girl Scouts senior roundup encampment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 661); and

H.R. 4323. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 662).

#### RESOLUTION

#### INCREASED EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 189) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-seventh Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

#### U.S. DISARMAMENT AGENCY FOR WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, some time ago, S. 2180, to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. It is one of those bills that could have been referred to either the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Committee on Government Operations. I have discussed this matter with the Chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. He has no objection to having the bill referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I ask unanimous consent that such action be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 3, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 857) to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore.

#### ADDITIONAL APPENDIX MATTERS

By Mr. MUNDT:

Speech entitled "In Today Already Walks Tomorrow," given by Dr. Louise Surra Fernandez, director of home economics teaching curriculum, New York University, at the Standard Brands "Three R's" breakfast, Cleveland, Ohio, June 28, 1961.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Citation presented by the Vice President

of the United States to the retiring chief and other members of the U.S. Secret Service.

Article entitled "West Germany Beehive of Action," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of August 1, 1961.

Article entitled "Everything Free but Life in Soviet," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of August 1, 1961.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.

#### TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate adjourn under the order previously entered, until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, August 4, 1961, at 10 o'clock a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 3, 1961:

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

I nominate Capt. James C. Tison, Jr., to be Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey with the rank of rear admiral for a term of 4 years, pursuant to law, vice Rear Adm. Charles Pierce, retiring.

##### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years. (Reappointment)

##### U.S. ATTORNEY

Brockman Adams, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Charles P. Moriarty.

##### THE JUDICIARY

Guthrie F. Crowe of the Canal Zone to be U.S. district judge for the district of the Canal Zone for a term of 8 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 2, 1960.

J. Cullen Ganey, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. circuit judge for the third circuit, vice a new position.

##### U.S. MARSHAL

George A. Bukovatz, of Montana, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Montana for the term of 4 years, vice Louis O. Aleksich.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, August 3, 1961:

##### TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Crane C. Hauser, of Illinois, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service).

##### BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

George K. Brokaw, of California, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

Anton Sestric, Jr., of Missouri, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo.

Joseph P. Rostenkowski, of Illinois, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.



# House of Representatives

THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Joel 2: 32: *And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered.*

Almighty God, as we again enter upon a day of serious business, may our minds and hearts be delivered from a sense of the futility of our adventures and efforts to establish the kingdom of peace and good will among men.

We humbly acknowledge that we are so frequently tempted to take counsel with our anxieties and fears and allow them to fetter and shackle us and undermine our faith in Thy divine sovereignty and our loyalty to the noble traditions of our God-fearing forefathers who purchased, with blood and sacrifice, the blessings of the freedom which we now enjoy.

Inspire and help us to hasten that blessed day of prediction when all the sinister forces of evil, that enslave and enthrall humanity, shall be conquered and destroyed and the spirit of man, which our Lord came to set free, shall be too strong for chains and too large for imprisonment.

Hear us, in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7035. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 77. An act to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes.

S. 981. An act to extend certain authority to the Secretary of the Interior exercised through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, to areas outside the national domain; and

S. 1899. An act to increase the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 857) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore."

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 7445 may have until midnight Friday, August 4, to file a conference report thereon, and that said report may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notwithstanding the fact that the House may not be in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## TOUGHER POLICIES AND LAWS NEEDED IN CUBAN AIRCRAFT HIJACKING

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have good reason to be outraged today by another flagrant violation of both American rights and law, in which Cuban bandits apparently are involved. I refer to the hijacking of the Continental Air Lines jet airliner, and the forceful kidnaping and detention of both passengers and crew by the armed hijackers.

There seems to be some question among lawyers about the applicability of Federal kidnaping laws in cases of this kind, although I have seen no briefs on the legal question.

The act of actual seizure of passenger aircraft, endangering the lives of people abroad, is a vicious and heinous crime calling for extreme penalties of law, and there should be no question of any kind about the availability of such penalties.

Since a number of bills already have been introduced on this question, and since hearings on the matter are likely next week, my only purpose at this time is to urge that Congress proceed

as quickly as possible to clarify laws on this important subject—and to make it clear also that the law carries with it the death penalty in aggravated cases.

Added toughness in the law should be accompanied without delay by added toughness on the part of both the administration and law enforcement officers in countering and dealing with the criminals responsible.

It should also be clear that the time has come to adopt a much harder and tougher policy toward the Kremlin-dominated gang in Cuba which has been inspiring, if not actually masterminding, the acts of air piracy in our country.

The people are not only ready for a tougher policy all along the line; the people are rightfully demanding it.

## TRAVEL PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3279) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"Sec. 5. Paragraph (3) of section 553 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out '10 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '12 cents' and by inserting immediately after the words 'the actual cost of' the words 'parking fees,'"

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"Sec. 6. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall promulgate, in accordance with section 604(a) (7) and section 456 of title 28 of the United States Code, such regulations as he may deem necessary to effectuate the increases provided by this Act."

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"Sec. 7. The seventh paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the Senate section of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 68b), is amended by striking out '\$12' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$16', and by striking out '\$25' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$30.'"

Page 2, line 7, strike out "5" and insert "8".

Page 4, line 8, strike out "6" and insert "9".

Page 4, line 9, strike out "2870" and insert "2870".

Page 4, line 13, strike out "7" and insert "10".

Page 5, line 1, strike out "8" and insert "11".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

### CONTENTS

Issued August 7, 1961  
For actions of August 4, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 133

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Adjournment.....          | 8      |
| Appropriations.....       | 2,9,14 |
| Budgeting.....            | 11     |
| Civil defense.....        | 2,9    |
| Defense mobilization..... | 9      |
| Disaster relief.....      | 9      |
| Development Loan Fund.... | 1      |
| Electrification.....      | 4      |
| Farm program.....         | 5      |
| Foreign aid.....          | 1      |
| Forest highways.....      | 14     |
| Forest Service.....       | 14     |
| Forestry.....             | 14,15  |
| General provisions.....   | 14     |
| Inflation.....            | 7      |
| Official Register.....    | 9      |
| Peace Corps.....          | 3      |
| Personnel.....            | 7      |
| Postal rates.....         | 13     |
| Research.....             | 5,6    |
| School aid.....           | 2      |
| Water compacts.....       | 10     |
| Water pollution.....      | 6,12   |

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate began debate on foreign aid authorization bill. Conferees submitted conference report on independent offices appropriation bill. Senate passed Defense Department appropriation bill. Senate committee voted to report Peace Corps bill.

### SENATE

- FOREIGN AID.** Began debate on S. 1983, the foreign aid authorization bill (pp. 13640-7, 13660-85). Agreed to the committee amendments en bloc so that the bill as amended could be considered as original text for purposes of amendment (p. 13659). Pending at adjournment was an amendment by Sen. Byrd, Va., to provide that the Development Loan Fund shall be financed by appropriations authorized annually rather than by long-term borrowing authority as provided in the bill (pp. 13659, 13660-85).  
Sens. Prouty, Mundt, Saltonstall, and Monroney submitted amendments intended to be proposed to S. 1983. pp. 13614-5
- DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962.** By a vote of 85 to 0, passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 7851 (pp. 13624-35, 13637-9). Conferees were appointed (p. 13639). By a vote of 37 to 47, <sup>rejected</sup> a motion by Sen. Mundt to suspend the rules for the purpose of proposing an amendment to extend for a 3-year period Federal assistance to schools in federally impacted areas (pp. 13624-33). Rejected an amendment by Sen. Young, O., to strike out the item of \$207,600,000 for the Defense Department for civil defense activities (pp. 13633-5). Rejected an amendment by Sen. Young, O., to reduce the item for civil defense activities from \$207,600,000 to \$100,000,000 (pp. 13637-8).

3. PEACE CORPS. The Foreign Relations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 2000, to provide for the establishment of a Peace Corps. p. D664
4. ELECTRIFICATION. The Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 1606, to authorize the Federal Power Commission to exempt small hydroelectric projects from certain licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act (S. Rept. 664). p. 13608
5. FARM PROGRAM; RESEARCH. Received from the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Government two resolutions "favoring the establishment of a Midwestern agriculture committee in that council, and favoring a plan for agricultural products utilization." p. 13607
6. WATER POLLUTION. Received from the Okla. Legislature a resolution favoring the establishment of a water pollution research center in that State. pp. 13607-8
7. PERSONNEL; INFLATION. Sen. Bush expressed concern over a report "that there has been a steady increase of 66,844 Federal employees in the last 5 months of the fiscal year," contended that this was inflationary, and inserted a newspaper editorial discussing the dangers of inflation and stating that "It is not true, whatever the Government's economic experts may think, that our economy needs the stimulation of inflation in order to grow." pp. 13618-9
8. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 7. p. 13689

HOUSE

9. APPROPRIATIONS. Received (during adjournment of the House) the conference report on H. R. 7445, the independent offices appropriation bill (H. Rept. 850) (pp. 13690-2). This bill includes \$5,000,000 for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies, and \$6,000,000 for the President for disaster relief. The Senate amendment providing \$30,000 for publication of the Official Register listing Government officials was deleted by the conferees.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. WATER COMPACTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Toll praising the Delaware River Basin Compact, and saying, "The need for a Delaware River Basin compact has long been a need of the country." p. A6062
11. BUDGETING. Extension of remarks of Sen. Humphrey inserting a statement of David E. Bell, Director of the Budget Bureau, before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Committee on Government Operations on long-term budget planning. pp. A6066-7
12. WATER POLLUTION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Morse discussing the pollution of the Merrimack River, the establishment of the Northeast Water Pollution Research Laboratory, and saying, "This would be an important step toward the purification of the waters of the Merrimack and the cleaning up of what has been referred to as one of the biggest open sewers in the country." pp. A6068-9



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

---

AUGUST 4, 1961.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. THOMAS, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

### CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 7445]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 30, 41, 43, 44, 48, 58, 60, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 20, 22, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 42, 56, 62, 63, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, and 76, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by the amendment, amended to read as follows: *That the foregoing amount shall be available for not to exceed 310 positions in the District of Columbia area: Provided further, ;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$30,050,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$78,250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$21,349,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by the amendment, amended to read as follows: : *Provided, That the Civil Service Commission shall include annually, in its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget, estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts paid out of the fund by reason of the enactment of Public Law 85-465, and the Bureau of the Budget shall submit such estimates annually to the Congress; and the Senate agree to the same.*

## Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,074,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$434,300,000; and the Senate agree to the same.



## Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by the amendment, amended to read as follows: *That total costs of aviation medicine research for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed \$2,000,000 or include in excess of 130 positions: Provided further, ;* and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$11,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$10,345,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$173,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$188,946,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,593,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$28,374,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,400,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$14,566,450; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

*For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$375,000.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$22,075,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$9,197,500; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 53:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$206,750,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,220,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$245,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$17,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$263,250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,800,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$161,773,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$43,876,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$29,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$76,250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$700,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$59,650,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 23, 26, 29, 35, 36, 47, and 80.

ALBERT THOMAS,  
SIDNEY R. YATES,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,  
JOHN TABER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
LISTER HILL,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,  
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
ROBT. S. KERR,  
GORDON ALLOTT,  
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*



## STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

### TITLE I

#### OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Amendment No. 1: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed \$6,000.

Amendment No. 2: Authorizes \$3,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$6,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to rental of passenger motor vehicles from the General Services Administration.

Amendment No. 4: Restores House language relating to positions in the District of Columbia amended to provide a ceiling of 310 positions instead of 303 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$5 million for civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,567,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$30,050,000 for emergency supplies and equipment instead of \$21,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$2 million for research and development instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$78,250,000 for payments to air carriers instead of \$74,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$81,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Authorizes not to exceed \$6 million for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year instead of \$5 million as proposed by the House and \$6,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$21,349,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$21,029,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,669,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Restores House language relating to payment to the civil-service retirement and disability fund with technical amendment.

Amendment No. 12: Authorizes \$1,074,000 for administrative expenses, employees health benefits fund, instead of \$1 million as proposed by the House and \$1,148,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Deletes item proposed by the Senate for \$30,000 for the Official Register of the United States.

## FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$434,300,000 for operations instead of \$428 million as proposed by the House and \$440,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Restores House language earmarking funds for aviation medical research amended to provide \$2 million and 130 positions instead of \$1,500,000 and 120 positions as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17: Appropriate \$120 million for facilities and equipment as proposed by the House instead of \$124,577,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore House provision prohibiting use of funds for the construction of a new wind tunnel.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19: Delete language proposed by the Senate authorizing the purchase of passenger motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$20,100,000 for construction and development of the additional Washington airport as proposed by the Senate instead of \$26,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$11 million for feasibility studies of the development of a civil supersonic aircraft instead of \$10 million as proposed by the House and \$12 million as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference does not intend that such study be undertaken at a cost of \$50 million over a 2-year period as indicated in the Senate report, but that the total cost should be held down to not more than \$20 million as testified to the House when it considered the item.

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$12,525,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

X

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$10,345,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$10 million as proposed by the House and \$10,690,000 as proposed by the Senate.



## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$173 million for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service instead of \$170 million as proposed by the House and \$176 million as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$188,946,500 for construction of public buildings projects instead of \$171,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$194,456,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Deletes House language and inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 30: Deletes language proposed by the Senate for the General Services Administration stores depot at Denver, Colo.

Amendment No. 31: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$789,000 for the project at Tupelo, Miss.

Amendment No. 32: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$20 million for the project at Pittsburgh, Pa.

Amendment No. 33: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$901,000 for the project at Dyersburg, Tenn.

Amendment No. 34: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$1,258,000 for the project at Montpelier, Vt.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 36: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$3,593,500 for operating expenses of the Federal Supply Service instead of \$3,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,737,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$28,374,500 for expenses of supply distribution instead of \$27,375,000 as proposed by the House and \$29,374,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$6 million for capital for the General Supply Fund instead of \$4 million as proposed by the House and \$8 million as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Appropriate \$2,400,000 for operating expenses of the Transportation and Public Utilities Service instead of \$2,475,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,175,000 as proposed by the Senate; and delete language proposed by the Senate. In agreeing to a lesser amount the managers on the part of the House do not agree with the application of the reduction as stated in the Senate report. The reduction below the House amount is to be applied uniformly to all activities financed from this appropriation.

The conferees expect the General Services Administration to act with good judgement and not enter into any harassing activities, to avoid trivialities, and protect the interest of the Government as a consumer. The conferees also suggest that the respective legislative committees review the basic legislation to determine if any revision is needed.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$40 million for strategic and critical materials as proposed by the Senate instead of \$30 million as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 43 and 44: Restore language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Authorizes \$14,566,450 for the administrative operations fund instead of \$14,268,900 as proposed by the House and \$14,864,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Inserts Senate language and appropriates \$100,000 for the working capital fund instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Reported in disagreement.

#### HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 48: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate relating to urban planning grants and planned public works advances.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$7 million for the public works planning fund instead of \$6 million as proposed by the House and \$8 million as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Restores language proposed by the House and deletes language proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$375,000 for urban studies and housing research instead of \$450,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference has denied the request for funds for a study of new standards of housing and neighborhood quality, but has allowed funds for special census data on housing conditions of the elderly; periodic statistics on sales prices and sales volume of new homes; study of credit factors in mortgage foreclosures; family displacement by public improvement programs; and intermunicipal approaches to planning, development, and renewal.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates \$22,075,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$21,950,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53: Authorize \$9,197,500 for expenses of travel instead of \$8 million as proposed by the House and \$10,395,000 as proposed by the Senate, and appropriate \$206,750,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$191,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$221,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$1,220 million for research and development instead of \$892 million as proposed by the House and \$1,278 million as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 55 and 56: Appropriate \$245 million for construction of facilities instead of \$116,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$249,250,000 as proposed by the Senate, and delete House language earmarking funds as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Authorizes \$17,500 for emergency or extraordinary expenses instead of \$15,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 58: Restores House language concerning operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act.



## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates \$263,250,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$250 million as proposed by the House and \$276,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Authorizes \$37,600,000 for tuition, grants, and allowances as proposed by the House instead of \$32,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Authorizes \$1,800,000 for purchase of foreign currencies instead of \$1,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$2 million as proposed by the Senate.

## RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Amendment No. 62: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate authorizing not to exceed \$45,000 for expenses of travel.

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 63: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate authorizing payment to individuals for services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem.

## VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$161,773,000 for general operating expenses instead of \$161,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$162,046,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$43,876,500 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses instead of \$40,700,000 as proposed by the House and \$47,053,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Authorizes \$29,500,000 for medical research instead of \$27 million as proposed by the House and \$32 million as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates \$76,250,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities instead of \$75 million as proposed by the House and \$77,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 68 through 72: Make technical corrections in reference to the loan guaranty revolving fund as proposed by the Senate, and restore House limitation of \$120,624,000 on funds for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 73 and 74: Insert language regarding payments to interagency motor pools as proposed by the Senate.

## TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

## FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Amendments Nos. 75 and 76: Adopts Senate language inserting reference to section 408 of the National Housing Act.

## HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 77: Authorizes \$2 million for administrative expenses in connection with college housing loans instead of \$1,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Authorizes \$700,000 for administrative expenses in connection with public facility loans instead of \$650,000 as proposed by the House and \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79: Authorizes \$59,650,000 for nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration, instead of \$58 million as proposed by the House and \$61,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80: Reported in disagreement.

ALBERT THOMAS,  
SIDNEY R. YATES,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,  
JOHN TABER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

○









14. COMMON MARKET. Rep. Reuss discussed the Common Market and said, "U. S. policy can bring a new unity to the West -- the unity of a free world Common Market." pp. 13760-2
15. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. As reported (see Digest 131), H. R. 8354, the proposed Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961, includes provisions as follows: Provides that the Secretary of Labor shall provide for the organization of a Youth Conservation Corps. Directs the Secretary to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies under which trainees in the Corps will be utilized in carrying out programs planned and designed by such agencies to conserve, develop, or manage the natural resources of the Nation, or in developing, managing, or protecting recreational areas. Requires that States defray up to one-half of the cost incurred for trainees utilized by the State. Provides that Federal agencies which have direction and supervision of the work of trainees shall furnish quarters, subsistence, materials, services, facilities, and other items for the trainees, including the operation of Corps camps, and that the Secretary of Labor will make payments to the supervising agencies for items furnished. Requires the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to cooperate in making provisions for medical, hospital and educational services for trainees. Authorizes the Secretary of Labor, if he determines such action necessary, to furnish necessary supplies, equipment, etc., and to operate camps directly. Provides that each trainee in the Corps will receive basic compensation at the rate of \$70 a month, with up to an additional \$20 a month for leadership responsibilities or special skills (in addition to his quarters, clothing, medical services, etc.).

SENATE

16. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7445, and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President (pp. 13722-3, 13821-7). See Digest 133 for items of interest.
17. FORESTRY. Sen. Bartlett discussed the timber resources of Alaska, expressed regret that more funds were not provided in fiscal year 1962 for research by the Forest Service, and commended the forest research station to be constructed at the University of Alaska. pp. 13780-2
18. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. Sen. Moss discussed the desirability of establishing a Youth Conservation Corps to assist in developing and maintaining our natural resources and inserted several items on the matter. pp. 13784-5
19. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Fulbright discussed "the question of borrowing authority versus annual appropriations for development loans" in financing the foreign aid program and inserted a statement he had prepared, "Short History of Proposals for Borrowing Authority for Development Lending." pp. 13802-4
- Sen. Fulbright inserted a summary of comments from representatives of the executive branch commenting on the statement of Sen. Byrd, Va., in submitting his proposed amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill to require annual appropriations for loans from the Development Loan Fund. pp. 13880-1
- Sen. Humphrey urged support for the foreign aid program, stating that "it is the kind of solid political, economic policy that not only makes friends abroad but represents jobs, industrial expansion, technological improvement at home." p. 13884
- Received from the State Department a proposed bill "to provide for the appointment of a representative of the United States to the Organization for



Economic Cooperation and Development, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in that organization"; to Foreign Relations Committee. p. 13774

20. PROPERTY; SUPPLIES. Received from GAO an audit report on the general supply fund of GSA. p. 13774
21. POSTAL RATES. Received from the Post Office Department a proposed bill "to adjust postal rates"; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 13775
22. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. McCarthy criticized the practice of railroad mergers, referred to a study contending that "railroad service deteriorates rather than improves as a result of railroad mergers," and inserted several items protesting such mergers, including one from the manager of the Ormsby (Minn.) Farmers Grain Co. pp. 13795-7
23. CIVIL DEFENSE. Sen. Young, O., inserted a newspaper article, "Fallout Shelter Can't Guarantee Survival." pp. 13783-4
24. MANPOWER RESOURCES. As reported (see Digest 129), S. 1991, the proposed Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, includes provisions as follows: Provides that the Secretary of Labor shall evaluate the impact of automation on the Nation's human resources and develop techniques which will predict the potential impact in advance; study practices of employers and unions which affect worker mobility; appraise manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs and work experience; promote information concerning manpower; and arrange for general research and investigation to further the purpose of the program. Requires the Secretary of Labor to develop information regarding skill requirements and training activities on a National, State or area or other basis for use in performing training, counseling and placement activities under the program. Requires the Secretary of Labor to develop policies for the development and utilization of the skills of the Nation's workers and to promote the development of training programs designed to qualify for employment persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without such training. Provides for a program of testing, counseling, selection, training and placement of unemployed or underemployed persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure appropriate full-time employment without training. Authorizes Federal payments to States to pay weekly Federal training allowances to persons undergoing training for periods not to exceed 52 weeks. Requires the Secretary of Labor to develop programs for on-the-job training and to cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in coordinating on-the-job training with vocational training programs. Provides that the Secretary of Labor shall appoint a National Advisory Committee of 10 members representing labor, management, agriculture, education, training, and the public in general to advise him regarding this program. Authorizes agreements with States to provide training or retraining of persons under this program by State vocational education agencies.

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

25. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Extension of remarks of Rep. McCormack inserting a tabulation prepared by HEW showing personal property made available to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations through June 30, 1961. pp. A6085-6
26. EXPENDITURES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Derounian inserting an article, "The Fine Art of Spending," and stating that it "shows the path of bankruptcy the Congress has taken." pp. A6088-9



mentation outside any such customs collection district."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to legalize the practice of American fishermen that has been going on for years, id est, that of returning each other's catch to port. This practice is particularly adapted to the operation of the shrimp fishery of the Gulf of Mexico. The legislation would allow a U.S. fishing vessel operating under an enrolled license, to return the catch of another U.S. fishing vessel to a port in the United States without being held under existing customs law to have violated its enrolled license. Since existing customs regulations allow such a privilege to fleet owners whose boats operate under an enrolled license, this bill would only extend this privilege to small operators who own only one or two vessels.

The legislation is needed to allow freshly caught seafood to be delivered to market while still of fresh and desirable quality. Fishing vessels that have exhausted their provisions must return to their home port for reprovisioning, and on such occasion take on board and return the current catch of other fishing vessels operating in the same area. This practice allows vessels with adequate provisions to remain on the fishing grounds for extended periods of time. There is no preset pattern to such an operation. Therefore, a vessel captain does not know until departure time from the fishing grounds whether or not he will be asked to return the catch of other vessels.

In the Senate companion bill, S. 1222, passed by the Senate May 26, there was an amendment suggested by the Treasury Department for clarification that inserts the following language in lines 8 through 11 of the original bill, which reads "shall not be considered as engaged in the transportation of freight for hire, solely because such vessel occasionally takes on board on the high seas and transports without a monetary consideration to a port of the United States, the catch of another fishing vessel of the United States."

Evidently, this was desirable from the Bureau of Customs viewpoint to make clear that a U.S. vessel enrolled and licensed in the mackerel fishery should keep, as its chief occupation, that of a fishing vessel and not engage in the transporting of seafoods under such license as its chief occupation. Since there is no preset pattern to such activity as is envisioned in H.R. 682, the word "occasionally" as used in the amendment of the Senate bill shall be construed to mean "incidentally" as in reference to its regular fishing activity. In such case a vessel could foreseeably return the catch of other vessels on two or more successive return trips to its own port, but the vessel would have been engaged primarily in fishing between such trips. Bearing in mind that these vessels stay at sea for as long as 60 days, it would appear that such a definition for "occasionally" would completely fill the needs of the industry.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMITTING CERTAIN FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS TO LAND THEIR CATCHES OF FISH IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3159) to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 4311 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 251), is further amended by designating the present section as subsection (a) and by adding the following new subsections:

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not be deemed to prohibit the landing by a foreign-flag vessel of not more than fifty feet overall length in a port of the Virgin Islands of the United States for immediate consumption in such islands of its catch of fresh fish, whole or with the heads, viscera, or fins removed, but not frozen, otherwise processed, or further advanced. No fish landed under this authorization shall be sold or transferred except for immediate consumption. Sale or transfer to an agent, representative, or employee of a freezer or cannery shall be deemed to be prohibited in the absence of satisfactory evidence that such sale or transfer is for immediate consumption. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'immediate consumption' shall not preclude the freezing, smoking, or other processing of such fresh fish by the ultimate consumer thereof.

"(c) Any fish landed in the Virgin Islands of the United States which are retained, sold, or transferred other than as authorized in subsection (b) of this section shall be liable to forfeiture and any person or persons retaining, selling, transferring, purchasing, or receiving such fish shall severally be liable to a penalty of \$1,000 for each offense, in addition to any other penalty provided in law."

SEC. 2. Any fine, penalty, or forfeiture incurred under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to remission or mitigation in accordance with section 5294 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 7).

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury may issue such regulations as he deems necessary for the enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### RESTORING CAPITAL IMPAIRMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the Consent Calendar No. 186 for the present consideration of the bill (S. 763) to authorize annual appropriation to re-

imburse Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year in lieu of annual appropriations to restore capital impairment based on annual Treasury appraisals, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That sections 1 and 2 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U.S.C. 713a-1, 2), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount sufficient to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for its net realized loss incurred during such fiscal year, as reflected in its accounts and shown in its report of its financial condition as of the close of such fiscal year. Reimbursement of net realized loss shall be with appropriated funds, as provided herein, rather than through the cancellation of notes.

SEC. 3. In the event the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation reflect a net realized gain for any such fiscal year, the amount of such net realized gain shall be deposited in the Treasury by the Commodity Credit Corporation and shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMITTING MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES TO ACCEPT FELLOWSHIP SCHOLARSHIPS OR GRANTS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the Consent Calendar No. 177 for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 7727) to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the Member who asked that this bill be passed over?

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes, it has been cleared.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:



"§ 2603. Acceptance of fellowships, scholarships, or grants

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a fellowship, scholarship, or grant may, under regulations to be prescribed by the President or his designee, be made by a corporation, fund, foundation, or educational institution that is organized and operated primarily for scientific, literary, or educational purposes to any member of the Armed Forces, and the benefits thereof may be accepted by him—

"(1) in recognition of outstanding performance in his field;

"(2) to undertake a project that may be of value to the United States; or

"(3) for development of his recognized potential for future career service.

The benefits of such a fellowship, scholarship, or grant may be accepted by the member in addition to his pay and allowances."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"2603. Acceptance of fellowships, scholarships, or grants."

SEC. 2. Section 221 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 213a), is amended by adding the following new clause at the end thereof:

"(9) Section 2603, Acceptance of fellowships, scholarships, or grants."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 351

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I request that the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 351, be removed from the suspension list so that the Committee on Foreign Affairs can give further consideration to this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has taken this up with the sponsor of the resolution and the committee as well as with the Speaker.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 4, 1961.)

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, when this bill left the House, it showed a reduction of about \$221 million under the budget. The budget figure was \$8,625,561,000. It went to the other body. We wound up with 80 items in disagreement, and I can report to the House, in truth and in fact, there are no items in disagreement. Under the rules, we bring back to you only seven items in technical disagreement while, in truth and fact, there is not one single item in disagreement. When the other body considered the bill, they raised the House figure about 694 million. The two big items constituting the raise are the Space Agency, in the amount of some \$549 million, and the addition of \$25 million for sites and planning of public buildings. That item went out on the floor of the House on a point of order. The point of order was sustained and rightly so, but the legislative committee has recently authorized the projects. So there are the two big points so far as the money items are concerned. The conference figure is \$8,966,285,000. We reduced the Senate figure in the neighborhood of about \$132 million.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of any questions, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 16, line 23, insert: "Provided, That the limitation until June 30, 1962, on the availability of the appropriation for a special ultra-high frequency television study, contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961, under the head 'Federal Communications Commission', is hereby extended until December 31, 1962."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 19, line 16, insert: "and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 20, line 18, insert: "Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 22, line 19, insert: "Provided further, That funds in the amount of \$5,601,500 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961, for a construction and alteration project at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, since abandoned as to its previously approved scope, are hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 23, line 1 insert:

"SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate insert the following:

"SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959, 1960 and 1961, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 30, line 17, insert: "Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: Provided, That such



transfers shall apply only to operating expenses and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 54, line 18, insert: "Provided further, That the foregoing limitation shall not apply to fees and other expenses paid by and between private parties in connection with cases processed under the Certified Agency Program."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The table referred to follows:)

Summary of independent offices appropriation bill, 1962

| Item   | Budget estimates (revised) | Passed House  | Passed Senate | Conference action | Conference action compared with— |              |              |
|--|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|  |                            |               |               |                   | Budget estimates                 | House        | Senate       |
| Executive Office of the President: National Aeronautics and Space Council..... | \$320,000                  | \$320,000     | \$320,000     | \$320,000         |                                  |              |              |
| Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....                                  | 104,200,000                | 79,167,000    | 95,500,000    | 86,550,000        | -\$17,650,000                    | +\$7,383,000 | -\$8,950,000 |
| Funds appropriated to the President: Disaster relief.....                      | 6,000,000                  | 6,000,000     | 6,000,000     | 6,000,000         |                                  |              |              |
| Civil Aeronautics Board.....   | 90,750,000                 | 83,700,000    | 90,600,000    | 87,150,000        | -3,600,000                       | +3,450,000   | -3,450,000   |
| Civil Service Commission.....  | 95,502,000                 | 91,844,000    | 92,514,000    | 92,164,000        | -3,338,000                       | +320,000     | -350,000     |
| Federal Aviation Agency.....   | 744,300,000                | 723,500,000   | 736,677,000   | 724,800,000       | -19,500,000                      | +1,300,000   | -11,877,000  |
| Federal Communications Commission.....   | 12,525,000                 | 12,400,000    | 12,525,000    | 12,525,000        |                                  | +125,000     |              |
| Federal Power Commission.....  | 8,793,000                  | 8,793,000     | 8,793,000     | 8,793,000         |                                  |              |              |
| Federal Trade Commission.....  | 10,690,000                 | 10,000,000    | 10,690,000    | 10,345,000        | -345,000                         | +345,000     | -345,000     |
| General Accounting Office.....   | 43,000,000                 | 43,000,000    | 43,000,000    | 43,000,000        |                                  |              |              |
| General Services Administration.....   | 552,170,000                | 510,390,000   | 580,382,500   | 568,904,500       | +16,734,500                      | +58,514,500  | -11,478,000  |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....                                      | (3,935,000)                | (3,935,000)   | (3,935,000)   | (3,935,000)       |                                  |              |              |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency.....   | 445,500,000                | 426,918,000   | 428,593,000   | 427,843,000       | -17,657,000                      | +925,000     | -750,000     |
| Interstate Commerce Commission.....  | 22,200,000                 | 21,950,000    | 22,200,000    | 22,075,000        | -125,000                         | +125,000     | -125,000     |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....                             | 1,784,300,000              | 1,200,000,000 | 1,749,000,000 | 1,671,750,000     | -112,550,000                     | +471,750,000 | -77,250,000  |
| National Capital Housing Authority.....  | 40,000                     | 40,000        |               | 40,000            |                                  |              | +40,000      |
| National Science Foundation.....   | 277,000,000                | 250,000,000   | 276,500,000   | 263,250,000       | -13,750,000                      | +13,250,000  | -13,250,000  |
| Renegotiation Board.....   | 3,000,000                  | 2,900,000     | 2,900,000     | 2,900,000         | -100,000                         |              |              |
| Securities and Exchange Commission.....  | 11,015,000                 | 11,000,000    | 11,000,000    | 11,000,000        | -15,000                          |              |              |
| Selective Service System.....  | 34,475,000                 | 33,670,000    | 33,670,000    | 33,670,000        | -805,000                         |              |              |
| Veterans' Administration.....  | 4,924,846,000              | 4,884,571,000 | 4,893,970,000 | 4,889,270,500     | -35,575,500                      | +4,699,500   | -4,699,500   |
| Grand total:   |                            |               |               |                   |                                  |              |              |
| Definite appropriations.....   | 9,170,626,000              | 8,400,163,000 | 9,094,834,500 | 8,962,350,000     | -208,276,000                     | +562,187,000 | -132,484,500 |
| Indefinite appropriations.....   | 3,935,000                  | 3,935,000     | 3,935,000     | 3,935,000         |                                  |              |              |
| Total.....   | 9,174,561,000              | 8,404,098,000 | 9,098,769,500 | 8,966,285,000     | -208,276,000                     | +562,187,000 | -132,484,500 |

#### AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF A MILITARY DEPARTMENT TO SELL GOODS AND SERVICES TO AIRCRAFT OWNERS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7728) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 2483. Supplies and services: aircraft owner or his agent

"(a) The Secretary of a military department, under regulations to be prescribed by him, may authorize any military activity under his department to sell any of the following supplies or services to the owner of an aircraft, or his agent, when in an emergency it is necessary to enable an aircraft to proceed to its next stop or when in the best interests of the United States:

"(1) Fuels and lubricants.

"(2) Equipment.

"(3) Parts.

"(4) Supplies.

"(5) Mechanical and maintenance service.

"(6) Food.

"(7) Shelter and other assistance.

"(b) Sales under subsection (a) shall be for cash, or on terms that will assure prompt

payment, and at prices that the Secretary concerned, or his designee, considers adequate reimbursement for the items sold.

"(c) If the items set forth in clauses (1)-(7) of subsection (a) are reasonably available from commercial sources, they may not be sold under subsection (a). Whenever the present or anticipated activity at a facility which has no commercial supply sources would support such a source, the Secretary concerned shall encourage its creation unless such a source would conflict with intergovernmental agreements relating to that facility, military security interests, or the discharge of the functions of that facility.

"(d) Whenever such a use would benefit the United States and would not interfere with its need for those supplies or facilities, the Secretary concerned may contract, without net cost to the United States, and at reasonable charges, for—

"(1) the use or bulk transfer of refined petroleum supplies of the United States that are under his jurisdiction, on a cash or reimbursable-in-kind basis; and

"(2) the use of any fuel or lubricant storage facility or distribution system under his jurisdiction.

"(e) Subsections (a)-(d) apply also to aircraft owned by, or registered in, any friendly foreign nation.

"(f) Except as otherwise provided by law, amounts received under this section shall be credited to the current applicable appropriation, fund, or account, and may be used for any purpose for which that appropriation, fund, or account may be used, including the procurement of goods and services similar to those furnished under those subsections.

"(g) This section does not affect the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies or services under section 7227 of this title."

(2) By adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"2483. Supplies and services: aircraft owner or his agent."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I know some fear has been expressed by airport managers here in the United States that we might be putting the military into the business of selling goods and services in competition with private operators.

Nothing could be further from the truth, as a matter of fact. Virtually all of the testimony that was taken referred to overseas bases. Greenland, Wake Island, some points in Alaska, Japan, these were the areas constantly referred to.

As we all well know, there are commercial sources for goods and services scattered throughout the United States. There simply is not any real need for the use of this authority in this country.

The only exception which was brought out during the hearings on this bill was with respect to contract carriers of the Air Force. Let us say that the contract involves picking up cargo at Andrews Air



Force Base and bringing it to the west coast. In this case, fuel would be sold to the contract carrier at Andrews Air Force Base.

Otherwise, the carrier would have to land at Washington National Airport, pay the landing fees, purchase his fuel, then take off and fly to Andrews to pick up the contract cargo.

Obviously this would be not only inconvenient but would also involve a greater expense to the Federal Government since the landing fee and other expenses which would be involved would find themselves in the contract price. This is inevitable.

Mr. Speaker, I think the objections that have been made to this bill arise from a misunderstanding of its objectives, and possibly of its provisions.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the explanation the gentleman from Massachusetts has made on this particular piece of legislation. I am not opposing it, and I do not expect to vote against it. However, some questions have been raised by airport managers and other people interested in our civilian airports in California.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question:

To what extent does the gentleman feel that base commanders or others to whom a decision might be left with reference to whether or not an aircraft might meet the qualifications in this bill, to what extent may he go beyond the normal requirements in the procedure which the gentleman has described?

I agree that in connection with emergency cases there is no question but what these planes should be serviced. The point is that many privately owned and municipally owned airports depend on their income from local merchants in the dispensation of oil, parts, and so forth. I hope we are not getting into something where the Federal Government is going into business in competition with these people.

Mr. PHILBIN. This bill will not permit that result. It is only when it is certain that these supplies and services are not reasonably available from commercial sources that the bill applies. An emergency must exist. That is the way the bill will be interpreted in my judgment and that is the intent of the measure.

Mr. SISK. I would like to ask one further question.

I have a letter from the local manager of my own airport in Fresno, Calif., in which he says:

It is felt that H.R. 7728 is too broad inasmuch as the title itself reads, "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes." No one would have any objection to military airfields providing fuel, food, and maintenance to any aircraft landing at a military installation due to an emergency and needing these services to get to its next stop or destina-

tion. Further, no one would have any objection to such services being rendered to civil aircraft by military agencies if such aircraft were engaged in an airlift or other contract agreements with civil aircraft or air carriers; however, on page 2, lines 19 through 25, of H.R. 7728, provides, "Whenever the present or anticipated activity at a facility which has no commercial supply sources would support such a source, the Secretary concerned shall encourage its creation unless such a source would conflict with intergovernmental agreements relating to that facility, military security interests, or the discharge of the functions of that facility."

This I feel to be too broad coupled with the last few words of the title, "and for other purposes."

This primarily, is the language with which they are very much concerned.

Mr. PHILBIN. As I stated, no such contingency would develop, as these services would be rendered only in emergencies under the language provided in the bill.

Mr. SISK. In other words, it would be my understanding, then, that in the event there should be any abuses, let us say, an effort to expand this service to the extent where a substantial amount of supplies were being purchased from the military bases, your committee, I am sure, would step into this matter and correct the situation.

Mr. PHILBIN. In that event, the gentleman may be assured that our committee would immediately step in and handle the situation and promptly move to rectify such abuses as were shown to exist.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the full committee when this bill was rather hurriedly considered, at that time I sought the opportunity to present some amendments. That opportunity was denied me.

After the bill was passed from the full committee, I contacted the manager of my local airport in San Jose, Calif. This manager expressed a great deal of concern regarding this bill, and requested my opposition.

I submit herewith a copy of a letter written by Mr. James N. Nissen, airport manager, at San Jose, Calif., to the Honorable CARL VINSON.

JULY 25, 1961.

HON. CARL VINSON,  
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

(Attention of Phil Kelleher).

DEAR MR. VINSON: H.R. 7728 has been brought to my attention. Congressman GUBSER has informed me that he intends to have the legislative intent established so that the bill would become acceptable. I do not agree that this will solve the problem, and on behalf of the city of San Jose and together with other of Mr. GUBSER's constituents, am requesting and urging that he oppose the bill.

Our opposition to the bill is based upon the fact that it establishes a major national policy without benefit of consideration or recommendation of the owners of public airports in the United States. The American Association of Airport Executives was not informed of this bill, nor was the

California Association of Airport Executives. To my knowledge, no organization representing the public airports of the Nation were informed or invited to participate in the consideration of this bill.

This bill would make it permissive to establish a national system of federally owned airports, under the control of the military, which would be used jointly by the military and civil. The military would be leasing space to operators on military fields and would in some cases provide the fueling and maintenance facilities themselves. While it is recognized that the use of bases by the military is decreasing and will probably continue to decrease in the future, it is believed that there are other more desirable ways of continuing use of the facilities under civil ownership and use. While it might not be intended in the bill that military airports would be in direct competition with civil airports, it can very well occur, even though the airports may be a hundred miles apart. As an example—an airline serving San Jose, Vandenberg, Los Angeles, and San Diego on a military charter basis, could purchase all their fuel and maintenance at Vandenberg, since they could take advantage of the military contract price of fuel without the markup which is necessary for operation of civil airports. They could also use the military personnel for maintenance of their aircraft at a far lower hourly rate than that necessary by private enterprise. Lines 17, 18, and 19 on page 2 do not, in our opinion, prevent the occurrence of the above-mentioned objections.

The effects of H.R. 7728 are so far-reaching that it is believed that a full hearing in which the owners and operators of civil airports should be permitted to state their case, should be required before this bill should become law.

For the above reasons, we have requested Congressman GUBSER to vigorously oppose the passage of this bill, unless it were amended to be applicable only for aircraft in case of emergency.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. NISSEN,  
Airport Manager.

After receiving a copy of the above-mentioned letter, I decided to oppose this bill on the Consent Calendar and so notified the committee staff. Immediately thereafter I learned that H.R. 7728 would be considered under suspension of the rules.

When I learned on Friday of the plan to suspend the rules, I again contacted my constituent, Mr. Nissen. He immediately contacted national trade associations and I might say that a great deal of opposition was generated in one short weekend.

I have received telegrams and letters from the National Aviation Trades Council; California Aeronautic Association; Addison Airport in Dallas, Tex.; an airport official in Montgomery, Ala.; one in Delaware, and another in New Jersey; one in Daytona Beach, Fla., another in Malta, Mont.; a letter from the South Dakota Aviation Trade Association; a letter from Van Nuys, Calif.; the Council of Aviation Operators; another letter from Long Beach, Calif.; the Indiana Airport Officials Association; a letter from Anderson, Ind., and others. None of these national associations knew of the existence of this bill until last Friday.

To summarize their opposition I am going to read one letter to you. This was delivered to me this morning from



I can say that America is most fortunate in its environment. It is not that Americans are superior, it is that they have been able to take advantage of their tremendous natural resources. America is very generous to Korea and other nations because she can afford to be generous. Korea would love to help the United States and other nations, but with what? With all kinds of Korean troubles? All people are selfish, all races are selfish, all nations are selfish—their own benefits come first. The stronger one is right and he will be a winner. The weaker one is wrong and he will be a loser. Today Korea is weak and she is a loser. I would love, and I shall still try, to make Korea and the Mongoloid race strong and a winner.

For me, Roanoke College has been an excellent place for learning English, American customs, and making friends. I have had so much fun with students in sports, travels, studying poop, fraternity parties and dormitory life. After graduation, I will be going to Duke University for my postgraduate work.

Some of you I shall never see again. Good luck on your final exams and be happy. I shall remember all of you.

Thank you.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 4, 1961, pp. 13690-13691, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for the information of the readers of the RECORD and of Senators who are present, I wanted to bring the conference report up now because the bill contains the large appropriation for the space program, namely, \$1.6 billion-plus. The Senate added the \$549 million asked for by the President and authorized by the two Space Committees unanimously about 2 weeks ago, and this amount was reduced by \$77 million in the conference. The budget estimates for 1962 totaled \$1,784,300,000, and the conference agreement of \$1,671,750,000 is a reduction of \$112 million.

Other than that, the conference with the House resulted in very little disagreement. For some of the independent agencies, the Senate had recommended the budget amount and the House had recommended less. In many cases we split the difference with the House, so that the agencies will have sufficient money to proceed with the public business.

The bill also had in it the controversial language of the Senate regarding the activities of the General Services Administration in the field of representing the Government in public utility hearings. The Senate language was stricken from the bill. A part of the money that had been reduced was agreed to. The amount agreed to is \$100,000 below the budget estimate for the Service. The report contains language agreed to by both Houses, with the hope that the proper legislative committees will go into this matter in both the House and the Senate, because it is primarily a legislative matter concerning the extent of the activities of GSA.

The Senate put in the bill four new projects for public buildings, namely, at Tupelo, Miss.; Dyersburg, Tenn.; Montpelier, Vt.; and the large one at Pittsburgh. The House agreed with the Senate that the four items in the so-called priority list of the General Services Administration were all projects that could begin this next year.

We had a cutoff date of December 31.

Other than that, the House and Senate were pretty much in agreement with respect to all the items.

Several Senators expressed interest in the research item for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Senate cut out the money which the House had provided, mainly because we did not know with which of the 11 suggested research projects the House was concerned. We ended up by allowing five of the projects with an appropriation of \$375,000, which coincides with the House amount of some \$450,000, with the deletion of one of the projects given on a priority list. Other than that, the bill remains practically the same as passed by the Senate.

The bill as a whole is \$208 million under the budget estimates.

I should like to have the conference report agreed to today, if possible, because of the importance of permitting the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to know exactly the amount of money it will have available for the space program.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wished to check on the particular item having to do with housing research. Is \$475,000 the correct figure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The budget estimate was \$900,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The House made that \$450,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House provided for 11 different projects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House cut the figure to \$450,000. As the Senator will remember, we took out the entire amount, so that we could find out with which projects the House wished to proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A list of six projects was submitted, and the conferees agreed to five. One project was a little confusing in the minds of the conferees, so we accepted 5 of the 11 projects. That was the amount provided.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It totals up to \$375,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are the main projects the Senator from Alabama was interested in.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It includes housing for the elderly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It includes housing for the elderly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was marked at \$125,000, and agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished acting minority leader [Mr. Fong] that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], a member of the committee and one of the conferees, wished to be present when the report was considered, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum was to make it possible for the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to be here. The Senator worked very hard in regard to the whole appropriation bill, as well as in the conference. I believe the Senator has some comments to make on the conference report.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, one of the items which I wished to discuss, covered in the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, is the item for the General Services Administration. The Senate committee originally made a reduction of \$300,000,



in funds for the activities of GSA before the various public utility and railway commissions of the country, as well as before the regulatory bodies of the Federal Government.

Because of personal circumstances beyond my control I was not able to be in the Senate the day the bill was discussed and the day the amendment seeking to change this provision was defeated by a very strong vote of the Senate.

The bill which has come from the conference to the Senate is a bill in which certain portions have been stricken, and language has been modified, but I think it is significant to note two or three things.

First of all, there is a reduction in the requested appropriation. The testimony before the committee was unequivocal that the GSA, in its legal activities before the various regulatory agencies of the State governments, and even before the regulatory agencies of the Federal Government, had gone far beyond the scope that had originally been intended when asked to represent the Federal Government as a consumer or user of the various services. With this particular aspect no one can quarrel. It was the intention of Congress—and I believe the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee originally started this plan—that the GSA appear before the regulatory agencies to represent the Federal Government as a consumer or user, as the case might be, and see that the Government is not discriminated against in any way. I call particular attention to the following language in the Appropriations Committee report on the independent offices appropriation bill this year:

GSA's obligation to participate in major transportation and utility regulatory proceedings is not disputed. It is accepted that they should appear as necessary to represent the interests of the Government as a user and insure that the rates and services provided are reasonable and fair as they apply to the Government, in comparison with rates charged other users. What is disputed is participation in these proceedings for the presentation of evidence and argument covering broad matters of regulatory policy such as valuation, rate of return, and other subjects related to overall regulatory policy of the various commissions.

If the Federal Government regulatory agencies are not representing the public—and I do not say that they are in this position—then it is time for us to take a good, long, hard look and find out what we can do about the situation. Government regulatory agencies, as well as State regulatory agencies, showed some annoyance at the rather high-handed manner in which GSA had appeared in some of the proceedings. It had attempted not merely to appear as a user or consumer, but actually to influence and control the regulatory policies of the Federal and State regulatory agencies—policies which, in the case of the State regulatory agencies, are set by State law.

It is the latter procedure to which we have objected. The House also com-

mented on this point, and the prohibition in the bill was severe. But it would still have permitted GSA to appear as representatives of the consumers. We have taken out that harsh language in the final bill. I read from the conference report:

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Appropriate \$2,400,000 for operating expenses of the Transportation and Public Utilities Service instead of \$2,475,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,175,000 as proposed by the Senate; and delete language proposed by the Senate. In agreeing to a lesser amount the managers on the part of the House do not agree with the application of the reduction as stated in the Senate report. The reduction below the House amount is to be applied uniformly to all activities financed from this appropriation.

The further language appears:

The conferees expect the General Services Administration to act with good judgment and not enter into any harassing activities, to avoid trivialities, and protect the interest of the Government as a consumer. The conferees also suggest that the respective legislative committees review the basic legislation to determine if any revision is needed.

I call particular attention to the language in the report, which states:

To protect the interest of the Government as a consumer.

I do not think we want the GSA to come into any regulatory commission of any State, nor do we want them to come into the regulatory commissions of the Federal Government, under the cloak and disguise of representatives of the Federal Government, to tell the regulatory agencies what to do. Lest there be any mistake on the part of GSA as to the role it is to play in this field, I call particular attention to the following clause:

protect the interest of the Government as a consumer.

It is this provision that we expect to govern them. I believe the intent of the committee is that we expect them to do that and no more. We do not intend to have them attempt to control the basic overall valuation of utilities or to try to establish the rate policies of the utilities. These policies are prescribed by law, in the case of either the State or the Federal Government. I certainly do not want to see GSA attempt to take over defacto the basic ratemaking or regulatory functions of the Commissions.

I think it might be significant at this point, when we are talking about the growth of the Federal Government, to note a little item of \$300,000 cut out of a budget for a department which had very greatly outgrown itself and was following the best traditions of Parkinson's law; yet all sorts of pressure would have been brought to bear on many people to attempt to obtain a revision of this cut.

The testimony of the GSA itself before the subcommittee indicates that they really do not think they should abandon the policy which they have pursued.

I wish to make the RECORD perfectly clear now that GSA is empowered by law to represent the Federal Government as a consumer and as a user. Certainly the vote of the Senate showed that we expect the GSA to appear and act for, and to argue the interests of the Federal Government as consumer and user. We do not expect them to attempt to interfere with the ratemaking policies of either the State commissions, in the one instance, or the Federal regulatory commissions in the other.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I said I would furnish for the RECORD the amounts involved. The total budget amounts for the independent agencies was \$9,170 million. The Senate bill provided \$8,962 million, or a reduction from the budget of \$208 million.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7445, which was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7445) entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes".

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 23, 26, 29, 35, 47, and 80 to aforesaid bill, and concur therein.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 to aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate insert the following:

"SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959, 1960, and 1961, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the House message clears all amendments in disagreement except as to Senate amendment No. 36. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 36.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement showing action on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1962

| Item  | Appropriations,<br>1961 | Budget estimates, 1962 | House bill   | Senate bill  | Conference<br>action |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|
| <b>TITLE I</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| <b>EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| National Aeronautics and Space Council.....                                       |                         | \$320,000              | \$320,000    | \$320,000    | \$320,000            |
| <b>OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION</b>                                   |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | \$25,346,000            | 30,500,000             | 25,000,000   | 25,000,000   | 25,000,000           |
| Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....         | 6,567,000               | 8,700,000              | 6,567,000    | 5,000,000    | 5,000,000            |
| Federal contributions.....  | 16,000,000              | 22,000,000             | 22,000,000   | 22,000,000   | 22,000,000           |
| Emergency supplies and equipment.....   | 9,175,000               | 36,000,000             | 21,600,000   | 38,500,000   | 30,050,000           |
| Research and development.....   | 4,000,000               | 4,500,000              | 1,500,000    | 2,500,000    | 2,000,000            |
| Construction of facilities.....   |                         | 2,500,000              | 2,500,000    | 2,500,000    | 2,500,000            |
| Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....                              | 61,088,000              | 104,200,000            | 79,167,000   | 95,500,000   | 86,550,000           |
| <b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Disaster relief.....  |                         | 6,000,000              | 6,000,000    | 6,000,000    | 6,000,000            |
| <b>INDEPENDENT OFFICES</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| <b>CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | 7,852,500               | 9,050,000              | 8,900,000    | 8,900,000    | 8,900,000            |
| Payments to air carriers.....   | 82,500,000              | 81,700,000             | 74,800,000   | 81,700,000   | 78,250,000           |
| Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....   | 90,352,500              | 90,750,000             | 83,700,000   | 90,600,000   | 87,150,000           |
| <b>CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION</b>   |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | 20,761,000              | 21,829,000             | 31,029,000   | 21,669,000   | 21,349,000           |
| Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations..... | 462,000                 | 438,000                | 430,000      | 430,000      | 430,000              |
| Annuities under special acts.....   | 2,316,000               | 2,248,000              | 2,248,000    | 2,248,000    | 2,248,000            |
| Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund.....            | 2,500,000               | 5,450,000              | 4,500,000    | 4,500,000    | 4,500,000            |
| Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund.....              | 1,625,000               | 20,900,000             | 19,000,000   | 19,000,000   | 19,000,000           |
| Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.....                      | 46,329,000              | 44,637,000             | 44,637,000   | 44,637,000   | 44,637,000           |
| Administrative expenses, employees health benefits fund (limitation).....         |                         | (1,148,000)            | (1,000,000)  | (1,148,000)  | (1,074,000)          |
| Administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund (limitation).....          | (260,000)               | (262,000)              | (260,000)    | (260,000)    | (260,000)            |
| Official Register.....  |                         |                        |              | 30,000       |                      |
| Total, Civil Service Commission.....  | 73,993,000              | 95,502,000             | 91,844,000   | 92,514,000   | 92,164,000           |
| <b>FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Operations.....   | 388,164,000             | 441,000,000            | 428,000,000  | 440,600,000  | 434,300,000          |
| Facilities and equipment.....   | 164,600,000             | 126,000,000            | 120,000,000  | 124,577,000  | 120,000,000          |
| Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization).....           | 80,000,000              | 70,000,000             | 70,000,000   | 70,000,000   | 70,000,000           |
| Research and development.....   | 64,480,000              | 65,000,000             | 60,000,000   | 60,000,000   | 60,000,000           |
| Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports.....                         |                         | 6,000,000              |              |              |                      |
| Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport.....                       | 3,230,000               |                        | 3,225,000    | 3,225,000    | 3,225,000            |
| Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport.....                      | 2,450,000               |                        | 1,975,000    | 1,975,000    | 1,975,000            |
| Construction, Washington National Airport.....                                    | 4,500,000               | 4,200,000              | 4,200,000    | 4,200,000    | 4,200,000            |
| Construction and development, additional Washington airport.....                  |                         | 20,100,000             | 26,100,000   | 20,100,000   | 20,100,000           |
| Civil supersonic aircraft development.....  |                         | 12,000,000             | 10,000,000   | 12,000,000   | 11,000,000           |
| Total, Federal Aviation Agency.....   | 707,424,000             | 744,300,000            | 723,500,000  | 736,677,000  | 724,800,000          |
| <b>FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | 13,789,000              | 12,525,000             | 12,400,000   | 12,525,000   | 12,525,000           |
| <b>FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION</b>   |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | 8,163,500               | 8,793,000              | 8,793,000    | 8,793,000    | 8,793,000            |
| <b>FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION</b>   |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | 8,009,500               | 10,690,000             | 10,000,000   | 10,690,000   | 10,345,000           |
| <b>GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....  | 42,179,000              | 43,000,000             | 43,000,000   | 43,000,000   | 43,000,000           |
| <b>GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION</b>  |                         |                        |              |              |                      |
| Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....                                 | 169,992,000             | 176,000,000            | 170,000,000  | 176,000,000  | 173,000,000          |
| Repair and improvement of public buildings.....                                   | 58,000,000              | 60,000,000             | 58,000,000   | 58,000,000   | 58,000,000           |
| Construction, public buildings projects.....                                      | 165,441,000             | 181,325,000            | 171,600,000  | 194,456,500  | 188,946,500          |
| Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....                                | 21,000,000              | 5,000,000              |              | 25,000,000   | 25,000,000           |
| Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.....                                | 4,000,000               | 5,200,000              | 5,200,000    | 5,200,000    | 5,200,000            |
| Construction, Federal Office Building No. 7, Washington, D.C.....                 |                         | 26,175,000             | 23,700,000   | 23,700,000   | 23,700,000           |
| Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.....                                   | 4,422,000               | 3,737,000              | 3,450,000    | 3,737,000    | 3,593,500            |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....   | (3,243,500)             | (3,935,000)            | (3,935,000)  | (3,935,000)  | (3,935,000)          |
| Expenses, supply distribution.....  | 24,425,000              | 29,374,000             | 27,375,000   | 29,374,000   | 28,374,500           |
| General supply fund.....  | 20,000,000              | 8,000,000              | 4,000,000    | 8,000,000    | 6,000,000            |
| Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.....                    | 10,179,000              | 14,159,000             | 14,000,000   | 14,000,000   | 14,000,000           |
| Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service.....              | 2,536,000               | 2,500,000              | 2,475,000    | 2,175,000    | 2,400,000            |
| Strategic and critical materials.....   | 26,235,000              | 40,000,000             | 30,000,000   | 40,000,000   | 40,000,000           |
| Salaries and expense, Office of Administrator.....                                | 247,000                 | 250,000                | 290,000      | 290,000      | 290,000              |
| Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.....                       | 250,000                 | 300,000                | 300,000      | 300,000      | 300,000              |
| Refunds under Renegotiation Act.....  | 2,500,000               |                        |              |              |                      |
| Administrative operations fund (limitation).....                                  | (14,113,200)            | (14,864,000)           | (14,268,900) | (14,864,000) | (14,566,450)         |
| Working capital fund.....   |                         | 150,000                |              | 150,000      | 100,000              |
| Total, General Services Administration.....                                       | 509,227,000             | 552,170,000            | 510,390,000  | 580,382,500  | 568,904,500          |



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962—Continued

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1962—Continued

| Item   | Appropriations,<br>1961 | Budget esti-<br>mates, 1962 | House bill    | Senate bill   | Conference<br>action |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|
| <b>HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY</b>                           |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Office of the Administrator:                                     |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                       | \$11,015,000            | \$13,150,000                | \$12,900,000  | \$12,900,000  | \$12,900,000         |
| Urban planning grants.....                                       | 4,000,000               | 10,000,000                  | 3,600,000     | 3,600,000     | 3,600,000            |
| Public works planning fund.....                                  | 6,000,000               | 8,000,000                   | 6,000,000     | 8,000,000     | 7,000,000            |
| Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization).....  | 150,000,000             | 200,000,000                 | 200,000,000   | 200,000,000   | 200,000,000          |
| Urban studies and housing research.....                          |                         | 900,000                     | 450,000       | 125,000       | 375,000              |
| Housing for the elderly fund.....                                | 20,000,000              | 30,000,000                  | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000           |
| Total, Office of the Administrator.....                          | 191,015,000             | 262,050,000                 | 247,950,000   | 249,625,000   | 248,875,000          |
| Public Housing Administration:                                   |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Annual contributions.....  | 140,000,000             | 169,300,000                 | 165,000,000   | 165,000,000   | 165,000,000          |
| Administrative expenses.....                                     | 13,868,000              | 14,150,000                  | 13,968,000    | 13,968,000    | 13,968,000           |
| Total, Public Housing Administration.....                        | 153,868,000             | 183,450,000                 | 178,968,000   | 178,968,000   | 178,968,000          |
| Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency.....                      | 344,883,000             | 445,500,000                 | 426,918,000   | 428,593,000   | 427,843,000          |
| <b>INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION</b>                            |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                       | 21,451,500              | 22,200,000                  | 21,950,000    | 22,200,000    | 22,075,000           |
| <b>NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION</b>             |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                       | 170,760,000             | 226,686,000                 | 191,750,000   | 221,750,000   | 206,750,000          |
| Research and development.....                                    | 670,453,000             | 1,295,539,000               | 892,000,000   | 1,278,000,000 | 1,220,000,000        |
| Construction of facilities.....                                  | 122,787,000             | 262,075,000                 | 116,250,000   | 249,250,000   | 245,000,000          |
| Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....        | 964,000,000             | 1,784,300,000               | 1,200,000,000 | 1,749,000,000 | 1,671,750,000        |
| <b>NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY</b>                        |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Operation and maintenance of properties.....                     | 40,000                  | 40,000                      | 40,000        |               | 40,000               |
| <b>NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION</b>                               |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                       | 175,800,000             | 275,000,000                 | 250,000,000   | 276,500,000   | 263,250,000          |
| Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....    | (1,600,000)             | 2,000,000                   | (1,600,000)   | (2,000,000)   | (1,800,000)          |
| Total, National Science Foundation.....                          | 175,800,000             | 277,000,000                 | 250,000,000   | 276,500,000   | 263,250,000          |
| <b>RENEGOTIATION BOARD</b>                                       |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                       | 3,015,000               | 3,000,000                   | 2,900,000     | 2,900,000     | 2,900,000            |
| <b>SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION</b>                        |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                       | 9,517,500               | 11,015,000                  | 11,000,000    | 11,000,000    | 11,000,000           |
| <b>SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM</b>                                  |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                       | 33,169,400              | 34,475,000                  | 33,670,000    | 33,670,000    | 33,670,000           |
| <b>VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION</b>                                  |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| General operating expenses.....                                  | 164,350,000             | 162,046,000                 | 161,500,000   | 162,046,000   | 161,773,000          |
| Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses..... | 35,165,000              | 15,053,000                  | 40,700,000    | 47,053,000    | 43,876,500           |
| Medical care.....  | 863,206,000             | 1,009,171,000               | 987,171,000   | 987,171,000   | 987,171,000          |
| Compensation and pensions.....                                   | 3,800,000,000           | 3,543,000,000               | 3,500,000,000 | 3,500,000,000 | 3,500,000,000        |
| Readjustment benefits.....                                       | 344,000,000             | 80,376,000                  | 80,000,000    | 80,000,000    | 80,000,000           |
| Veterans' insurance and indemnities.....                         | 48,800,000              | 39,200,000                  | 39,200,000    | 39,200,000    | 39,200,000           |
| Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....                   | 1,000,000               | 1,000,000                   | 1,000,000     | 1,000,000     | 1,000,000            |
| Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....         | 75,000,000              | 75,000,000                  | 75,000,000    | 77,500,000    | 76,250,000           |
| Loan guarantee revolving fund (transfer).....                    |                         |                             |               |               |                      |
| Outpatient care (consolidated).....                              | 90,034,000              |                             |               |               |                      |
| Maintenance and operation of supply depots (consolidated).....   | 2,643,000               |                             |               |               |                      |
| Total, Veterans' Administration.....                             | 5,424,198,000           | 4,924,846,000               | 4,884,571,000 | 4,893,970,000 | 4,889,270,500        |
| Total, definite appropriations.....                              | 8,490,299,900           | 9,170,626,000               | 8,400,163,000 | 9,094,834,500 | 8,962,350,000        |
| Total, indefinite appropriations.....                            | 3,243,500               | 3,935,000                   | 3,935,000     | 3,935,000     | 3,935,000            |
| Total, title I.....  | 8,493,543,400           | 9,174,561,000               | 8,404,098,000 | 9,098,769,500 | 8,966,285,000        |

## Administrative and nonadministrative expenses

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

| Corporation or agency                                     | Authorization,<br>1961 | Budget estimates,<br>1962 | House bill    | Senate bill   | Conference action |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <b>TITLE II—CORPORATIONS</b>                              |                        |                           |               |               |                   |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board:                             |                        |                           |               |               |                   |
| Administrative expenses.....                              | (\$2,071,000)          | (\$1,725,000)             | (\$1,725,000) | (\$1,725,000) | (\$1,725,000)     |
| Nonadministrative expenses.....                           | (8,819,000)            | (10,366,000)              | (10,366,000)  | (10,366,000)  | (10,366,000)      |
| Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.....       | (857,000)              | (890,000)                 | (890,000)     | (890,000)     | (890,000)         |
| General Services Administration:                          |                        |                           |               |               |                   |
| Federal Facilities Corporation.....                       | (20,000)               |                           |               |               |                   |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund.....  | (43,000)               | (42,500)                  | (42,500)      | (42,500)      | (42,500)          |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency:                          |                        |                           |               |               |                   |
| College housing loans.....                                | (1,580,000)            | (2,100,000)               | (1,900,000)   | (2,100,000)   | (2,000,000)       |
| Public facility loans.....                                | (537,500)              | (750,000)                 | (650,000)     | (750,000)     | (700,000)         |
| Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....                | (148,500)              | (150,000)                 | (145,000)     | (145,000)     | (145,000)         |
| Federal National Mortgage Association.....                | (6,900,000)            | (7,450,000)               | (7,400,000)   | (7,400,000)   | (7,400,000)       |
| Federal Housing Administration:                           |                        |                           |               |               |                   |
| Administrative expenses.....                              | (9,011,000)            | (9,675,000)               | (9,600,000)   | (9,600,000)   | (9,600,000)       |
| Nonadministrative expenses.....                           | (52,988,000)           | (62,300,000)              | (58,000,000)  | (61,300,000)  | (59,650,000)      |
| Public Housing Administration:                            |                        |                           |               |               |                   |
| Administrative expenses.....                              | (13,868,000)           | (14,150,000)              | (13,968,000)  | (13,968,000)  | (13,968,000)      |
| Nonadministrative expenses.....                           | (1,200,000)            | (1,200,000)               | (1,200,000)   | (1,200,000)   | (1,200,000)       |
| Total, administrative and nonadministrative expenses..... | (98,043,000)           | (110,798,500)             | (105,886,500) | (109,486,500) | (107,686,500)     |



Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think the action just taken by the Senate is very appropriate. I am delighted to see that the language the Senate inserted regarding the GSA participation was taken out in conference. This act accomplishes what the Proxmire amendment intended to accomplish, and I think it is a great victory for the taxpayer.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to make a comment on the remark the Senator has made. In my recent remarks upon the floor, I tried to make the situation perfectly clear. The conference report does not leave the situation as the Senator from Wisconsin surmises. If it did, I would have come to the floor and asked that the conferees on behalf of the Senate be required to insist upon its language. It would be a great mistake to think that we had receded from the position that the Senate took a week ago Saturday.

No such intention appears in the language of the report, in which it says that the General Services Administration is expected to represent the interest of the Government as a consumer. I wished to call the Senator's attention to that language. The surmise that the Senate has receded is not in accord with the fact and not in accord with the discussions in the committee. That is the reason I took the floor a few minutes ago to call the attention of the Senate to this matter. I do thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to ask my friend from Colorado, if he thinks the Senate has not receded, what has the Senate done when it has gone along with the House in the restoration?

Mr. ALLOTT. We took out the drastic language. We put in the language which states that we expect GSA to represent the consumer, and not interfere with the regulatory policies imposed upon commissions by State law or with the regulatory policies of the Federal agencies as imposed by Federal law.

Mr. GRUENING. The cut was not as drastic as the one that had been proposed.

Mr. ALLOTT. It was modified somewhat.

Mr. GRUENING. As I am in favor of GSA continuing in that position, I am glad for what we got. I am sorry we did not get all of it.

Mr. ALLOTT. All I can say is that if the Senator will study the regulatory laws he will find it to be clear that if we are going to concede the position of the proponents of the amendment we might just as well do away with our Federal regulatory agencies and give GSA the complete power to make the rates.

Let me tell the Senate of one specific case in which GSA overstepped themselves very drastically, in which they left out a \$4 million indebtedness. If the regulatory agency involved had accepted

the figures of GSA in that instance it would have resulted in an immediate benefit, of course, by way of rates to the Government, but it also would have imposed additional rates on every other consumer affected by the additional rates decision.

The regulatory agencies have competent staffs to handle the peculiar problems each has, either in regard to geographical area or subject matter.

The testimony at the hearings shows unequivocally that each of these agencies—the ICC, the FPC, and all the others—has capable staffs and that they stated they were capable of presenting the Government's view and also of protecting the consumer's interest.

This is an obligation and duty put on them by law. GSA has come along as a sort of superpoliceman and has said that its judgment about regulatory matters is better than that of the staffs of the various commissions. We do want to protect the Government, as far as its rates for transportation, or gas, or electricity, or telephone service are concerned, and to see that they are adjusted fairly. We do not believe they have the right to come in with all the force of the Federal Government and say, "This is the Federal Government speaking," present their case for changes in basic regulatory policy, and then walk out again. They do not have the right before a State commission or before a Federal regulatory commission to usurp, either in law or in fact, the powers that have been placed upon a State commission by a State legislature or by a State constitution and upon a Federal commission by Congress itself.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator. However I disagree with him in saying that the regulatory agencies have consistently performed competent jobs. It has been my observation that they have frequently failed to protect the interest of the consumer. I am glad to know that we have had an agency such as GSA which can help rectify that situation. It may be that the GSA has erred on occasion, but on balance I would say it has performed a most useful service. I am hopeful it will continue to render such service.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would say this frankly to the Senator from Alaska. I believe that in the activity to which they should be confined they have done a relatively good job. Beyond that, however, they cannot point with pride to their activities, because they have not accomplished anything. If we are going to impose this power on GSA, we might as well introduce a bill tomorrow—the Senator from Alaska and I—to do away with CAB and FPC and ICC, and all the other regulatory agencies. Undoubtedly, the Senator has in mind the Federal Power Commission. I am not unaware—and I could not be unaware—sitting as I have been sitting week after week in the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, of the great backlog of cases. We have done everything we could do to try to help them reorganize themselves and to reorganize their procedures. We have provided them will more examiners and legal help in order

to help them reduce the backlog. I am not unaware of this great problem, which undoubtedly the Senator is speaking of. However, this is not entirely the fault of the regulatory agencies, who have been working in many instances under great handicaps. Within the last 2 years, I believe the Senator will be interested in knowing, all of these agencies have undergone drastic procedural changes within their agencies in order to speed up the processing of this backlog of cases.

Mr. GRUENING. I hope the result will be not merely a speeding up, but a greater awareness of the public interest rather than of the special interest. That is why I welcome the activities of the the GSA.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am in favor of protecting the public interest. I also believe that the man who invests money in a project should also be protected. The man who puts his investment on the line is also entitled to protection. If we are to abandon the concept of private property, and everything is going to be done for the good of the consumer, it will be a step that I will not be willing to take. We cannot say that we are going to look at the consumer interest alone. If that were so, we would have a 5-cent bus fare in Washington, D.C. We must also look at the interest of the man who puts his time and money on the line in order to try to make a fair return. That is all that these people are entitled to. That is all they are getting. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Once again I reassert what I said. The Proxmire amendment has in effect been restored. It seems to me that all that we were asking for and all that we wanted to get was to permit GSA to represent the Government as a consumer. We did not ask for anything else. Under the conference report the GSA can represent the Government right down the line. It is the kind of compromise I like. About 90 percent of the appropriations were left in.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for his very able fight in the Senate to restore these powers to GSA. That it has been accomplished, and that the bill is a much better bill than when it left the Senate is largely due to the efforts of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I deeply appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to a victory achieved today in behalf of the American taxpayer.

This was the restoration in conference of funds to permit the GSA to continue its proper function representing the Government as a consumer in the field of utility rate regulation—and the adoption by the Senate of this conference agreement.

The Allott amendment would have removed this function from GSA. This amendment was accepted by the Senate.



I spoke in this chamber on this point and warned of the dangers involved, of the millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money at stake, and of the pressures which brought this amendment into being in the independent offices appropriation bill. I regret that the Senate failed to defeat this portion of the bill.

I am happy to say that the conferees saw the light, restored the funds, and struck the language which would have tied GSA's hands and opened the door to uncontrolled millions of tax dollars.

In connection with this victory, I ask unanimous consent that three newspaper accounts of this battle—a story by Walter Pincus appearing in the Washington Post of August 5, 1961; and two accounts written by Jack Steele of Scripps-Howard which appeared, respectively, in the Washington Daily News on August 3, 1961, and on August 5, 1961—be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 3, 1961]

SAVED UNITED STATES \$160 MILLION—PRESSURE MAY WIPE OUT RATE AGENCY

(By Jack Steele)

House-Senate conferees will decide late today the fate of a drive to all but wipe out a Government agency which has saved the taxpayers and consumers hundreds of millions of dollars on utility and transportation rates.

The little-known agency is the Transportation and Public Utilities Service of the General Services Administration (GSA), which for years has represented the Government—and indirectly all consumers—in rate cases before Federal and State regulatory bodies.

The Government is the Nation's biggest consumer of telephone, telegraph, power, and transportation services.

This tiny GSA agency has saved the Government \$160 million in the last decade by obtaining reductions in utility and transportation rates. And it has saved the Government and consumers untold millions more by blocking proposed rate increases.

RIDER GETS OK

Yet the Senate, in a move which virtually escaped notice, approved on Monday a rider to the independent offices appropriation bill which would practically destroy the agency.

The rider would cut the agency's funds this year from \$390,000 to \$90,000 and bar it from presenting any evidence on the reasonableness of rates before Federal and State regulatory agencies.

The Senate vote climaxed a lobbying drive by utility and transportation interests led by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (A.T. & T.), whose rates have been a prime target of the agency.

Its most celebrated case in 1956 forced A.T. & T. to slash \$100 million from the rates it proposed to charge the Government for telephone circuits for Sage, a complex system to defend the Nation against manned bomber attacks.

WARNINGS

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, House Democratic leader, warned his colleagues yesterday that the Senate rider would cost the Government and consumers "untold millions" in higher utility and transportation charges.

Representative MCCORMACK, who had a major role in uncovering the excessive rates

sought by A.T. & T. in the Sage case, noted that Congress itself had insisted on creating the GSA agency to protect the Government from overcharges for such services.

Representative ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat of Texas, chairman of the House Appropriation Subcommittee which handles the bill, pledged that House conferees would not agree to the rider.

But the Senate on Monday struck down, by a 55 to 32 vote, an amendment by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, which would have killed the rider.

CHARGE

It did so despite a charge by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, that the rider was simply a reprisal against the GSA for its actions in forcing A.T. & T. to cut its rate to the Government.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, told the Senate that A.T. & T. was the real power behind the lobby which had pushed the rider in the Senate.

He noted that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce had led the fight for the lobby through its committee on communications and transportation. This committee, he reported, is headed by Ed Crosland, an A.T. & T. vice president.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 5, 1961]  
GSA'S WATCHDOG OVER RATES BEING MUZZLED BY UTILITIES

(By Walter Pincus)

A watchdog contingent within the General Services Administration, which has kept the Federal Government from paying more than \$160 million in excess utility and transportation charges, is being leashed and perhaps muzzled by a legislative maneuver directed mainly by utility company lobbyists.

Each year, the Government spends an estimated \$817 million for utility services and another \$386 million for communications. Thirty-nine men in three special divisions of GSA's Transportation and Public Utilities Service oversee these expenditures and represent the consumer interests of the Government in State and Federal regulatory hearings.

In many of these hearings, when user rates are determined, the Government is the largest and sometimes the only consumer involved.

The GSA presentation, based heavily on evidence concerning competitive prices, capital cost valuations and allowable return of investment, has over the years been forceful and oftentimes most effective. So effective, in fact, that utility companies appear to have adopted the old legislative adage, "If you can't beat 'em, take away their appropriation."

BILL PASSED BY SENATE

The vehicle being employed is the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, which last week passed the Senate.

The Senate Appropriations Committee, with active encouragement from the companies and over GSA objections, tacked a six-line legislative limitation on the operating expenses of GSA forbidding the use of funds "for the preparation or presentation of evidence or arguments before Federal or State regulatory agencies concerning the regulatory policies of such agencies on overall earnings level or total property evaluation of transportation or utility companies."

Proponents of the limitation say it will permit GSA to appear at hearings to argue the "fairness" of rates and services charged to the Government as compared with rates charged other users. It will prevent the introduction of statistical facts that, they say, are the responsibility of the commissions, not GSA.

Opponents argue that almost all rate hearings turn on issues that can be discussed only through the use of investment and

profit figures and analyses, and that to deny GSA the ability to introduce such matter would destroy the effectiveness of its participation.

FUND CUT \$300,000

To emphasize that it meant business the Senate committee also chopped \$300,000 from the \$400,000 programed to operate GSA's regulatory activity in fiscal 1962.

The Senate retained the committee limitation by a 55-to-32 vote, but during the debate, a number of Senators noted that GSA regulatory interventions caused no problem until 1958.

That was the year when the Federal Communications Commission ordered the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to reduce its private-line telephone rates by 15 percent, an action that saved the Government, as a consumer, about \$10 million a year.

GSA's regulatory watchdog bureau played an active role in the Federal Communications Commission investigation that led to the reductions. In fact, incentive awards totaling \$10,000 were divided among 12 GSA employees for extraordinary efforts that resulted in rate reductions far beyond expectations.

In 1959, a few questions were raised about these activities in appropriations hearings. But, the direct attack wasn't launched until November 1960, when the U.S. Chamber of Commerce released a 40-page report that concluded by recommending a limitation on "GSA's appropriation to expand its operations in the field of rate and fare regulation."

CROSLAND COMMITTEE JOB

This chamber report, according to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, was prepared by a committee whose chairman was A.T. & T. Vice President Ed Crosland. Since its release, KEFAUVER added, the lobby has "been working in the Nation's Capital, on both sides, trying to get something done."

Also in November, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, meeting in Las Vegas, adopted a resolution calling for restrictions on GSA's activities. Maine Public Utilities Commissioner Richard J. McMahon, who attended the session, called it "basically a fight between American Telephone & Telegraph and the Federal Government."

McMahon added, in a letter to Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, that the resolution was adopted by voice vote in a room containing possibly 100 commissioners and another 200 guests of the convention representing the affected industries. Requests for a rollcall vote were denied.

Armed with this resolution and the chamber report, lobbyists persuaded Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, to introduce the limitation. The language was such as to eliminate effective future GSA participation in any general rate hearing similar to the A.T. & T. case of 1958.

SENATORS GET CALLS

By the time the bill reached the floor, according to one Senate aid, A.T. & T. affiliates throughout the country were in contact with their Senators pushing support for the limitation.

One southern Senator, for example, who clearly sided with the utility, was visited in his office by representatives of Southern Bell on the Friday before the vote, and early Monday morning, the day of the vote, received a call from the Bell Telephone president of his State.

Conjuring up visions of days when legislatures sat in fear of big utility trusts, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, closed debate on the limitation by telling his colleagues:

"We all know what is behind this move. The General Service Administration has obtained reductions of \$145 to \$150



million from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The proposal of the committee is a reprisal against good work of the GSA in recovering these millions from A.T. & T."

What happens to the limitation when it gets to the House-Senate conference is not certain. But it surely depends on how much public protest is raised over what is going on.

[From the Washington Daily News,  
Aug. 5, 1961]

#### HOUSE OVERRULES SENATE RIDER—CURB ON GSA AGENCY IS BLOCKED

(By Jack Steele)

The House has stopped a Senate move to hamstring an obscure Government agency which has saved the taxpayers and consumers millions of dollars by blocking utility and transportation boosts.

The Senate voted Monday to all but wipe out the Transportation and Public Utilities Service of the General Services Administration (GSA)—despite its record of having saved the Government at least \$160 million in the last decade.

The Senate agreed to slash the agency's funds from \$390,000 to \$90,000 a year and to bar it from challenging the "reasonableness of rates" before Federal or State regulatory commissions.

#### WON'T JOIN IN

But House conferees led by Representative ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat of Texas, refused yesterday to join in.

As a result, a Senate-House conference committee agreed to restore all but \$75,000 of the agency's funds and to reaffirm its right to represent the Government as a consumer before Federal and State regulatory bodies.

Both Representative THOMAS and Representative SIDNEY YATES, Democrat, of Illinois, who also had sharply criticized the Senate's action, said they were "satisfied" with the conference action.

"This GSA agency will be able to continue to protect the taxpayers against excessive utility and transportation charges and will have adequate funds to operate," Representative YATES said.

#### IN PAST

He noted that the agency in the past had aided consumers only indirectly by opposing rate increases which would boost utility and transportation charges for both the Government and consumers.

The Senate rider which would have curbed its powers and funds was pushed by lobbyists for utility and transportation interests.

The Government is the Nation's biggest consumer of utility and transportation services, for which it spends about \$2 billion a year.

#### OFFICIAL REGISTER OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we have just passed an important appropriation bill, that for the independent offices. While I am glad that this legislation is now on the books, I wish briefly to express myself and comment for my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] on the amendment which the Senate adopted to continue the publication of the Official Register of the United States.

First of all, Mr. President, I regret that my colleague is absent, for he led the fight in the Senate to have the funds for the Official Register restored in the appropriation for the Civil Service Commission. I supported him in this amendment and, of course, share his disappointment that the conference committee bill for the independent offices does not include this item.

My colleague has asked me to speak for him today to the effect that he regrets the deletion of this item and that he personally pledges his efforts to continue the fight to restore the funds for this important publication in fiscal 1963. I commend the Senator for the way in which he handled his amendment. I think he is 100-percent correct, and I shall be happy to join with him in his future efforts to make available to the public the valuable information contained in the Official Register of the United States.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Lawrence J. O'Connor to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move to recommit the nomination of Lawrence J. O'Connor to the Commerce Committee with instructions to report it back to the Senate in 1 week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Wisconsin does not mean to ask for a vote on that motion now, does he?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have no intention of calling for a vote now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At the proper time the Senator intends to offer that motion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have already offered the motion. I obtained the floor to make the motion. I am speaking on the motion. I have not spoken on the nomination itself, but I am now speaking on the motion to recommit the nomination to the Commerce Committee for 1 week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the proviso that the Senator from Wisconsin does not lose his right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin to recommit the nomination to the Commerce Committee with instructions. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor, and yielded to various Senators, whose remarks appear elsewhere under the appropriate headings.

(At this point Mrs. NEUBERGER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I wish to accommodate Senators as much as possible during the course of this speech. Necessarily, it will be a long speech. I shall do my best to make it as germane as possible. I have no intention whatsoever of preventing a vote on the nomination, because there will be a vote on the nomination. However, I believe that before the vote is taken, the complete record of Mr. O'Connor, should be made known to the Senate and should be discussed in considerable detail. For that reason, my speech will take considerable time.

#### GAS MAN ON FPC

The nomination of Lawrence J. O'Connor puts a gas industry man on the inside of a body which was created to regulate the gas industry.

I have an editorial published by the Racine Journal-Times, an independent newspaper, which has never supported me for office, although I have run for office five times in Wisconsin. The Racine Journal-Times on July 28, 1961, published an editorial entitled "Proxmire Position Well Taken." This is what the editorial declared:

Appointing Lawrence O'Connor to the Federal Power Commission is like appointing Mickey Mantle to umpire Yankee baseball games," Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE of Wisconsin told a Senate committee Wednesday, and therein the Wisconsin Senator summed up very well the case against O'Connor's appointment. He is being asked to regulate an industry of which he has for years been an integral part.

Lawrence O'Connor of Texas is an oil man. That is his business, literally and figuratively, and his right. He is a former vice president of a Texas oil company. He is a member of several associations and organizations of oil men (incidentally one of them is most active in trying to get the FPC out of the business of regulating the industry altogether.)

But Lawrence O'Connor has no vested right to a position on the Federal Power Commission, which is supposed to regulate the natural gas segment of the oil industry, and the President of the United States has no business appointing him to that position.

But the Kennedy administration is showing itself no less vulnerable to the oil industry's boring from within than was the Eisenhower administration, the Truman ad-



administration or the Harding administration. Kennedy has named an oil man as his Secretary of the Navy, and another one as Assistant Secretary of Interior.

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Incidentally, Madam President, I opposed both those nominations. Both those nominations were clearly representative of a conflict of interest. The appointment of John Connally as Secretary of the Navy was the appointment of a man who is executor of one of the two or three largest private oil estates in the world. As Secretary of the Navy he buys all the oil for all the armed services, and he sits on top of the study of what is perhaps the most important competitive fuel—atomic energy.

The appointment of John M. Kelly as Assistant Secretary of the Interior is, in my judgment, even worse, because Mr. Kelly, as Assistant Secretary of the Interior, is in charge of minerals, which means that he is head of the Oil and Gas Office, head of the Oil Import Administration, head of virtually every agency of the Government which regulates the oil and gas industry; although Mr. Kelly disposed of millions of dollars of his holdings, he still holds on to millions of dollars in addition, and one of his richest and most important oil holdings he gave to his children, putting his own personal attorney in charge. I thought the conflict of interest was very sharp and very clear, and I protested it.

#### SHOCKING APPOINTMENT

Madam President, I feel that the appointment of Lawrence O'Connor is really shocking, because this man would be in the position of referee, umpire, and judge over the gas industry, in determining what rates it could charge; and, as I believe I can establish in the course of my presentation, the nominee has been thoroughly connected with the oil and gas industry. In fact, that has been his principal connection during his adult years.

I now read further from the editorial:

O'Connor, incidentally, has been serving in the Interior Department for the last 2 years. Those two Federal agencies are particularly subject to oil industry pressure.

Even with O'Connor's background, it is hard to see where he could make the Federal Power Commission's protective feeling for the oil industry more intense, or the FPC's neglect of the public interest more evident. Since Harry Truman's time, the FPC has been trying to abdicate its power to regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead, a relaxation of utility price control that would be felt right down to your gas furnace or gas stove in Racine. This is a strange sort of conduct for a Federal regulatory agency. (The U.S. Supreme Court found it so strange that it has repeatedly ordered the FPC to do its plain duty). But the FPC just doesn't want to regulate the price of natural gas, and it will not do so. Senator PROXMIRE pointed out Wednesday that the cost of natural gas for home heating purposes has risen 44½ percent in the past 12 years. For example, the gas company for which O'Connor himself worked as a vice president has been granted three increases in rates during the past 3 years, without a breath of FPC opposition or control.

#### "STRIKE AGAINST CONSUMER"

Madam President, this is the company of which the nominee for membership

on the Federal Power Commission was a vice president until 1959.

I read further from the editorial:

PROXMIRE calls this action by the alleged regulatory agency "a sitdown strike against the consumer."

Now an attempt is being made to subvert this regulatory body to the business it regulates still further, by putting an oil man on the Power Commission.

PROXMIRE is fighting the appointment, although it was made by the administration controlled by his own party. He may be fighting in vain, because the oil industry is not without influence in the Senate itself. But the Wisconsin Senator deserves the support of all those who are interested in impartial Federal utility regulation, to protect the consumer and the taxpayer against the kind of gouging they get from the oil industry.

Madam President, the appointment of Lawrence O'Connor would seem to me to mean built-in, guaranteed inflation to the 27 million gas-consuming families in the Nation—including the 500,000 gas-consuming families in my own State of Wisconsin. With such a background, the record is very clear that commissioners who have that viewpoint are very susceptible to the pleas of the gas industry for rate increases, and are also very susceptible to pleas of the producing industry to be exempted from regulation by the Federal Power Commission, as I think I can show convincingly.

#### TRIES TO BLOCK FPC

The fact is that Mr. O'Connor has been a leading member of the gas industry's association that has dedicated itself to preventing the Federal Power Commission from fulfilling its plain duty, according to the Supreme Court, to regulate the price of gas at the wellhead.

Madam President, the central importance of Federal Power Commission appointments should be recognized by the Senate when it acts on the question of confirmation of such a nomination. The fact is that those the President chooses to serve on the Federal Power Commission, the team he chooses, determine the action the Commission will take. In many ways, these selections are far more important than the legislation Congress passes.

As a matter of fact, in the Natural Gas Act of 1938, the Congress said that the Federal Power Commission should regulate the gas industry and the sale of gas in interstate commerce. Since 1954 there has been no question about that, because in the Phillips case, the Supreme Court interpreted that act, and made it clear that it meant the regulation of natural gas at the wellhead—the regulation of the producers. But in spite of this, the Federal Power Commission has simply refused to do it. If the Senate should advise and consent to the nomination of Lawrence O'Connor, the Senate would be advising and consenting to the nomination of a man who, on the record, and in view of his associations, obviously would continue to ignore this duty of the Federal Power Commission. This would result in frustration of the clear language of the Natural Gas Act of 1938.

#### O'CONNOR APPOINTMENT MEANS HIGHER GAS PRICES

Madam President, it seems to me that this nomination comes before the Senate at a time when we should be particularly conscious of what the Senate has done to the American taxpayers and the American consumers in the past week or 10 days. The appointment of Lawrence O'Connor, if confirmed, would add to the cost of living; and in studying the action of Congress in the last week or so on the Kennedy budget requests, it is obvious that the increased cost to John Q. Public, by way of higher taxes, will be substantial and specific. It is true that each determination by the Senate to increase appropriations over the amounts the President had requested—decisions which of course result in increased Government spending and increased taxes—is relatively modest and small in itself, in its impact on the taxpayers. But in the aggregate, they are substantial. However, their impact on the average citizen will be far, far less than the impact of the appointment of Lawrence O'Connor to the Federal Power Commission, because his appointment is going to result in higher gas prices, resulting in an additional cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, and in only a few years an additional cost of literally billions of dollars, to the gas consumers in the United States; and a very large proportion of all Americans are gas consumers.

Madam President, we have only to recollect what the Senate has done in the last few days. In dealing with the independent offices appropriation bill, the Senate voted for \$50 million more than the President had requested—\$50 million more of higher taxes, obviously, in the near future.

#### EXCEEDED PRESIDENT'S REQUESTS

In dealing with the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Congress voted appropriations \$300 million in excess of the President's requests, in the case of specific items; and Congress did that in a field in which the President himself is especially expert and compassionate. Of course that means \$300 million of higher taxes which the consumers will have to pay.

In dealing with the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense, Congress voted substantially more than the President's requests, particularly in appropriating for additional B-52 bombers—a 10-year old bomber, a subsonic bomber that is not competitive, according to even the testimony of proponents of this increased appropriation, with the best Russian bombers—against the advice of the Secretary of Defense, against the advice of the President, and at a cost to the taxpayers of \$525 million.

An even bigger blow to the pocketbook of the taxpayer and the consumer was the decision of the Senate—which has been largely canceled out by conference action—in the independent offices appropriation bill in providing that the General Services Administration should be disqualified from representing the











## An Act

75 STAT. 342.

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, namely: Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962.

### TITLE I

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

##### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem, \$320,000. 72 Stat. 427; ante, p. 46. 60 Stat. 810.

##### OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed \$6,000; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense and defense mobilization functions; not to exceed \$3,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of travel; \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for not to exceed 310 positions in the District of Columbia area: *Provided further*, That contracts for not to exceed two persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually, and one such contract, for the services of an expert or consultant for telecommunications, may provide for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75. 60 Stat. 810.

##### CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization functions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, \$5,000,000.

# FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to be equally matched with State funds, \$22,000,000, of which not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be available for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act.

64 Stat. 1245;  
72 Stat. 533.  
50 USC app.  
2251 note, 2286.

## EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing, distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, \$30,050,000.

50 USC app.  
2281.

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense and defense mobilization, including evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by section 201(d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and other law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

64 Stat. 1248.  
60 Stat. 810.

## CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the design, construction, and equipment of protected regional facilities for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

## GENERAL PROVISION

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

## FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

### DISASTER RELIEF

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

64 Stat. 1109.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES

### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem; \$8,900,000.

60 Stat. 810.



PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
AUTHORIZATION)

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$78,250,000, of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall be available for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, to remain available until expended. 72 Stat. 763.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed \$10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed \$83,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; \$21,349,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended. 60 Stat. 810.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943. 5 USC 1181, 118k-118n. 41 USC 5.

5 USC 631  
note.

3 CFR, 1943-  
1948 Comp.,  
p. 256.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY  
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$430,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January 9, 1953, as amended. 22 USC 287 note. 60 Stat. 810. 63 Stat. 166. 5 USC 835 note. 62 Stat. 697.

## ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775), \$2,248,000.

58 Stat. 258;  
70 Stat. 607.  
64 Stat. 465;  
72 Stat. 49.

## GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$4,500,000, to remain available until expended.

5 USC 3006.

## GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION, RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850), \$19,000,000.

5 USC 3053.

## PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the annuity benefits and increases provided by the Act of June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$44,637,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund: *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission shall include annually, in its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget, estimates of the appropriations necessary to reimburse the civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts paid out of the fund by reason of the enactment of Public Law 85-465, and the Bureau of the Budget shall submit such estimates annually to the Congress.

5 USC 2259  
note.

72 Stat. 218.

## LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

Not to exceed \$1,074,000 of the funds in the "Employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 713), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

5 USC 3001  
note.

60 Stat. 810.

## LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE FUND

Not to exceed \$260,000 of the funds in the "Employees life insurance fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a): *Provided*, That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

68 Stat. 736.  
60 Stat. 810.  
69 Stat. 678.

72 Stat. 87.



## FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

## OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; not to exceed \$10,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$434,300,000: *Provided*, That total costs of aviation medicine research for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed \$2,000,000 or include in excess of 130 positions: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

60 Stat. 170.  
49 USC 1101  
note.

## FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed \$50,000 per housing unit in Alaska); and purchase of nine aircraft; \$120,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF  
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, \$70,000,000, to remain available until expended.

49 USC 1101-  
1105, 1108,  
1111, 1104 note.

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301-1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 731.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms, and arms and ammunition, \$3,225,000.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms, and arms and ammunition, \$1,975,000.

## CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Washington National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,200,000, to remain available until expended.

## CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, ADDITIONAL WASHINGTON AIRPORT

For an additional amount for "Construction and development, additional Washington airport", \$20,100,000, to remain available until expended.

## CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), \$11,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## GENERAL PROVISION

During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including land and structures (not to exceed \$48,000), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed \$15,600), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$12,525,000: *Provided*, That the limitation until June 30, 1962, on the availability of the appropriation for a special ultrahigh-frequency television study, contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961, under the head "Federal Communications Commission", is hereby extended until December 31, 1962.

63 Stat. 907.

68 Stat. 1114.

60 Stat. 810.

74 Stat. 429.



## FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and not to exceed \$558,000 for expenses of travel, \$8,793,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for special counsel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a). 60 Stat. 810.

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$10,345,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation. 68 Stat. 1114. 60 Stat. 810.

## GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$43,000,000. 60 Stat. 810.

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

## OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); \$173,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for "Emergency operating expenses". 69 Stat. 722. 47 Stat. 412, 1517.

## REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for public buildings; preliminary planning of projects by contract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings con- 40 USC 601 note.

'68 Stat. 518,  
521.  
39 USC 2103-  
2116.

structed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 901 et seq.), and Public Health Service facilities (except Indian health facilities), and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration shall be considered to be public buildings.

#### CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct public buildings projects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including equipment for such buildings, \$188,946,500, and not to exceed \$500,000 of this amount shall be available to the Administrator for construction of small public buildings outside the District of Columbia as the Administrator approves and deems necessary, all to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings projects at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:

Post office and Federal office building, Decatur, Alabama \$1,315,750;

Customhouse and Federal office building, Los Angeles, California \$27,388,500;

Customs and appraisers warehouse, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, California, \$2,000,000;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Denver, Colorado \$18,145,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Statesboro, Georgia \$538,650, which shall be known as the Prince H. Preston Building;

Post office and Federal office building, Winder, Georgia, \$475,000;

Post office and Federal office building (construction and alteration) Wyandotte, Michigan, \$402,800;

Post office building, Tupelo, Mississippi, \$789,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Santa Fe, New Mexico \$2,362,650;

Customhouse, courthouse, and Federal office building, New York New York, \$59,222,050;

Post office and courthouse, Bryson City, North Carolina, \$753,350;

Post office building, Thomasville, North Carolina, \$327,750;

Border station, Pembina, North Dakota, \$183,350;

Federal office building, Cincinnati, Ohio, \$17,432,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Medford, Oregon, \$1,728,050

Post office and Federal office building (construction and alteration) Johnstown, Pennsylvania, \$1,187,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Lebanon, Pennsylvania \$730,550;

Federal office building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, \$20,000,000;

Post office building, Dyersburg, Tennessee, \$901,000;

Border station, Derby Line, Vermont, \$267,900;

Post office and courthouse, Montpelier, Vermont, \$1,258,000.

Government Printing Office field plant, District of Columbia \$1,545,650: *Provided further*, That the maximum construction improvement costs heretofore approved for the following projects are hereby increased as follows:



Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of Columbia, is increased from "\$15,105,000" to "\$18,905,000", including \$5,700,000 for laboratory and other equipment;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Chicago, Illinois, is increased from "\$5,500,000" to "\$36,793,000", including construction of the first of two buildings authorized at this location: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum: *Provided further*, That funds in the amount of \$5,601,500 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961, for a construction and alteration project at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, since abandoned as to its previously approved scope, are hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation.

74 Stat. 431.

#### SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959, 1960 and 1961, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 1066;

73 Stat. 505;

74 Stat. 431.

#### PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), \$5,200,000.

68 Stat. 518.

#### CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct Federal Office Building Numbered 7 in Washington, District of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch, in accordance with plans and specifications provided for in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1959 and 1961 (72 Stat. 1067 and 74 Stat. 432), \$23,700,000, to remain available until expended.

#### OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as authorized by law and not otherwise provided for, \$3,593,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,935,000 of any funds received during the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law, shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the General Services Administration under the said Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus personal property.

63 Stat. 388.

40 USC 485.

#### EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system, and contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items, \$28,374,500.

GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

To increase the general supply fund established by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 630g), \$6,000,000.

63 Stat. 382.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, \$14,000,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC UTILITIES SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation and public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals, \$2,400,000.

60 Stat. 810.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) during the current fiscal year, for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is responsible, including reimbursement for security guard services, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed \$3,000,000 for operating expenses, \$40,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held pursuant to the aforesaid Acts provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98(a)), may be transferred without reimbursement to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further*, That any receipts from sales during the current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

60 Stat. 596.

73 Stat. 607.

62 Stat. 1225.

60 Stat. 810.

60 Stat. 598.

50 USC 98e.

64 Stat. 798.

50 USC app.

2061.

50 USC 98b.



## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, \$290,000.

## ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$300,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act. 3 USC 102 note.

## ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited into said account for the fiscal year 1962 from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed \$14,566,450: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

## WORKING CAPITAL FUND

To increase the capital of the working capital fund established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293), \$100,000.

59 Stat. 115.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. 61 Stat. 584. 62 Stat. 1225. 50 USC 451 note.

Appropriations under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" shall be available for (1) acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) construction of projects for new public buildings approved pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959, in addition to those set forth under that appropriation. 73 Stat. 479. 40 USC 601 note.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Administration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing, directly or indirectly, such suitable general purpose space as may be required by any such department or agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

## HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$12,900,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of inspections and of providing representatives at the site of projects being planned or undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, projects and facilities financed by loans to public agencies pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, urban planning financed through grants to State and local government agencies pursuant to title VII of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and reserves of planned public works financed through advances to municipalities and other public agencies pursuant to title VII of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, shall be compensated by such agencies or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed \$3,000,000.

Typewriting  
machines.

63 Stat. 377.  
40 USC 471  
note.

40 USC 601  
note.

60 Stat. 810.

Ante, p. 153.  
42 USC 1450-  
1463.  
12 USC 1749-  
1749c.

Ante, p. 173.  
42 USC 1491-  
1496.

Ante, p. 170.  
40 USC 460-  
462.



URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$3,600,000.

73 Stat. 678.  
Ante, p. 170.  
40 USC 461.

PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), \$7,000,000.

69 Stat. 641.  
Ante, p. 175.

URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$200,000,000.

URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$375,000.

12 USC 1747  
note;  
12 USC 1703  
note.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$350,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year.

73 Stat. 667.  
Ante, p. 162.  
12 USC 1701q.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), \$165,000,000.

Ante, pp. 163,  
164.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, \$13,968,000, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the employment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and purchase of not to exceed forty-two passenger motor vehicles of which thirty-six shall be for replacement only; \$22,075,000, of which not less than \$1,696,700 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than \$1,129,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

60 Stat. 810.

---

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE  
ADMINISTRATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including not to exceed \$9,197,500 for expenses of travel, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$206,750,000.

68 Stat. 1114.

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For contractual research, development, operations, technical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction, and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of fourteen passenger motor vehicles, including one at not to exceed \$6,000, of which seven shall be for replacement only; \$1,220,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment of salaries of National Aeronautics and Space Administration personnel.

## CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$245,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation shall not be thereby increased.

Not to exceed \$17,500 of appropriations in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for such scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense as may be authorized by law.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective.

48 Stat. 930.  
D.C. Code 5-111.

64 Stat. 81.



NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$263,250,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,800,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act.

64 Stat. 149;  
72 Stat. 353.  
60 Stat. 810.  
  
72 Stat. 275.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, not to exceed \$45,000 for expenses of travel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) , \$2,900,000.

60 Stat. 810.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem, \$11,000,000.

68 Stat. 1114.  
60 Stat. 810.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; not to exceed \$62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and \$19,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; \$33,670,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

50 USC app.  
451 et seq.  
60 Stat. 810.  
  
31 USC 665.

## VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

### GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; \$161,773,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

### MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research, employee education and training activities, and expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical research, as authorized by law, \$43,876,500, of which \$29, -500,000 shall be available for medical research: *Provided*, That \$1,000, -000 of the foregoing appropriations shall remain available until expended for prosthetic testing and development.

### MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of seventy-two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code; \$987,171,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

### COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, \$3,500,000,000, to remain available until expended.

68 Stat. 1114.

72 Stat. 1146;

74 Stat. 424.

43 Stat. 125;

72 Stat. 1264.

38 USC note  
prec. pt. 1.



READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended. 58 Stat. 287; 72 Stat. 1273. 38 USC note prec. pt. 1.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, \$39,200,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, \$1,000,000. 72 Stat. 1145.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, \$76,250,000, to remain available until expended: 72 Stat. 1251. *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for technical services for replacement of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tennessee, is reduced from "\$1,500,000" to "\$921,600". 70 Stat. 339.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed \$120,624,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, Title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to said Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses. 72 Stat. 1203.

SUPPLY FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Supply fund shall be available for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented. Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a). 60 Stat. 810.

The appropriation available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Travel expenses. SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System, to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

Positions of employees entering Armed Forces. SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

Real estate. SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

## TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1962 for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:



## FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,  
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Not to exceed a total of \$1,725,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals, and shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided*, That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further*, That expenses of any functions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses (except those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed \$10,366,000.

60 Stat. 810.

68 Stat. 635.  
12 USC 1464.  
64 Stat. 259;  
73 Stat. 691.  
12 USC 1730,  
1730a.47 Stat. 725.  
12 USC 1421.LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND  
LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$890,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward

12 USC 1730,  
1730a.

the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-1730a).

48 Stat. 1255.

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

Not to exceed \$42,500 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the termination of contracts or in the performance of legal services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the account shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

71 Stat. 647.  
5 USC 133z-15  
note.

## HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States.

64 Stat. 77.



LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF  
THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Not to exceed \$700,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States. 69 Stat. 642.  
42 USC 1491-1496.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE  
ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$145,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL NATIONAL  
MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed \$7,400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE  
EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$9,600,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed \$1,500): *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing shall not exceed \$59,650,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitation shall not apply to fees and other expenses paid by and between private parties in connection with cases processed under the Certified Agency Program.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,  
PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433), including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed \$1,200,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent

48 Stat. 1246.

68 Stat. 1114.

63 Stat. 905.

12 USC 1702.

50 Stat. 888.

42 USC 1430.

68 Stat. 1114.

Publicity or  
propaganda.

Personnel  
work.



employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend halftime or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or leased buildings except where specifically provided. Fallout  
shelters.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962". Short  
title.

Approved August 17, 1961.

○











87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 7445

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 14, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, viz: On page 10, following line 16, insert the following:

- 1           OFFICIAL REGISTER OF THE UNITED STATES
- 2           For necessary expenses incurred in the compilation,
- 3 editing, indexing, and publishing of the Official Register of
- 4 the United States, \$30,000: *Provided*, That the United
- 5 States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be compiled,
- 6 edited, indexed, and published each year an Official Register
- 7 of the United States, which shall contain a full and complete
- 8 list of all persons occupying administrative and supervisory

1 positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches  
2 of the Government, including the District of Columbia, in  
3 connection with which salaries are paid from the Treasury  
4 of the United States. The register shall show the name;  
5 official title; salary, compensation, and emolument; legal  
6 residence and place of employment for each person listed  
7 therein: *Provided, however,* That the Official Register shall  
8 not contain the name of any postmaster or assistant postmas-  
9 ter, or any officer of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps,  
10 unless such officer is assigned as an administrative officer.  
11 To enable the United States Civil Service Commission to  
12 compile and publish the Official Register of the United States  
13 on or before December 31 of each year, the Executive Office,  
14 the legislative and judicial branches of the Government, the  
15 Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the head of  
16 each executive department, independent office, establish-  
17 ment, and commission of the Government shall, as of the 1st  
18 day of May of each year, supply to the United States Civil  
19 Service Commission the data required by this section, upon  
20 forms approved and furnished by the Commission, in due  
21 time to permit the publication of the Official Register as pro-  
22 vided in this section; and no extra compensation shall be  
23 allowed to any officer, clerk, or employee of the United  
24 States Civil Service Commission for compiling the Official  
25 Register.





---

## AMENDMENT

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVRS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

---

JUNE 14, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and  
ordered to be printed



# H. R. 7445

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 27, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1       On page 12, line 19, strike out the period, insert a colon
- 2   and the following: "*Provided*, That no payments shall be
- 3   made out of appropriations for the liquidation of contract
- 4   obligations entered into under such authority, which pro-
- 5   vide for the construction of airport terminal buildings contain-
- 6   ing racially segregated dining or other facilities, whether or
- 7   not the portions of such buildings containing such segregated
- 8   facilities have been constructed without Federal contri-
- 9   butions."

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> Session

# H. R. 7445

---

## AMENDMENT

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

---

JULY 27, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed



Calendar No. 593

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 7445

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 27, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, viz: On page 10, following line 23, insert the following:

- 1       OFFICIAL REGISTER OF THE UNITED STATES
- 2       For necessary expenses incurred in the compilation,
- 3 editing, indexing, and publishing of the Official Register of
- 4 the United States, \$30,000: *Provided*, That the United
- 5 State Civil Service Commission shall cause to be compiled,
- 6 edited, indexed, and published each year an Official Register
- 7 of the United States, which shall contain a full and complete

1 list of all persons occupying administrative and supervisory  
2 positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches  
3 of the Government, including the District of Columbia, in  
4 connection with which salaries are paid from the Treasury  
5 of the United States. The register shall show the name;  
6 official title; salary, compensation, and emolument; legal  
7 residence and place of employment for each person listed  
8 therein: *Provided, however,* That the Official Register shall  
9 not contain the name of any postmaster or assistant postmas-  
10 ter, or any officer of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps,  
11 unless such officer is assigned as an administrative officer.  
12 To enable the United States Civil Service Commission to  
13 compile and publish the Official Register of the United States  
14 on or before December 31 of each year, the Executive Office,  
15 the legislative and judicial branches of the Government, the  
16 Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the head of  
17 each executive department, independent office, establish-  
18 ment, and commission of the Government shall, as of the 1st  
19 day of May of each year, supply to the United States Civil  
20 Service Commission the data required by this section, upon  
21 forms approved and furnished by the Commission, in due  
22 time to permit the publication of the Official Register as pro-



1 vided in this section; and no extra compensation shall be  
2 allowed to any officer, clerk, or employee of the United  
3 States Civil Service Commission for compiling the Official  
4 Register.

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 7445

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

JULY 27, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed



Calendar No. 593

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 7445

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 28, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, viz:

1        On page 4, line 9, strike out “\$38,500,000” and insert  
2    in lieu thereof “\$36,000,000”.

3        On page 18, line 16, strike out “\$194,546,500” and  
4    insert in lieu thereof “\$181,325,000”.

5        Beginning with the word “projects” on page 18, line  
6    22, strike out all through line 12 on page 21, and insert  
7    in lieu thereof the following: “projects approved by the  
8    Public Works Committees of Congress in accordance with  
9    section 7 (a) of such Act.”

1       On page 21, line 19, strike out “\$25,000,000” and  
2   insert in lieu thereof “\$5,000,000”.

3       On page 26, lines 6 and 7, strike out “\$290,000” and  
4   insert in lieu thereof “\$250,000”.

5       On page 35, lines 16 and 17, strike out “\$276,500,000”  
6   and insert in lieu thereof “\$275,000,000”.

7       On page 38, line 7, strike out “\$47,053,000” and insert  
8   in lieu thereof “\$37,053,000”.

9       On page 38, line 8, strike out “\$32,000,000” and insert  
10   in lieu thereof “\$22,000,000”.

11       On page 40, line 23, strike out “\$77,500,000” and  
12   insert in lieu thereof “\$75,000,000”.





87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7445

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

JULY 28, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed



Calendar No. 593

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 7445

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 28, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, viz:

1       On page 23, line 24, strike out "\$2,175,000", and insert  
2   in lieu thereof "\$2,475,000".

3       Beginning with line 1, page 24, strike out all to and  
4   including line 6, page 24.

7-28-61—D

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST Session

# H. R. 7445

## AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. Proxmire to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

JULY 28, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed



# H. R. 7445

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 29, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. SCHOEPPLE to the bill (H. R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

- 1 On page 24, line 1, after the words "appropriated by"
- 2 insert the words "the preceding paragraph of".

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION  
**H. R. 7445**

---

# AMENDMENT

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. SCHORRELL to the bill (H. R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

---

JULY 29, 1961

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed